The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XIII — New York, Saturday, December 15, 1917 — Number 163

Contents

Editorial Notes 159

Leading Editorials
- The Diplomacy of Publicity 162
- Take Over the Railroads 164
- National Labor Exchanges 166
- "Too Much Unionism" 167
- Taxation *vs.* Loans Once More 168

General Articles
- "Down the River" ..... William Hard 170
- Counsel of Humility ..... Herbert Croly 173
- A Fear ..... Robert Silliman Hillyer 176
- Prudence and the Classics ..... Emily James Putnam 177
- Women in War Industries ..... Esther Norton 179
- The Russian Crisis ..... Isaac Don Levine 181

Correspondence 183

At the Capitol ..... C. M. 186

After the Play ..... Q. K. 187

Reviews of Books
- "The So-Called Irish Question" ..... F. H. 188
- Louis Untermeyer ..... M. T. 189
- An Ode to Freedom ..... H. S. 190
- The Open Mind ..... M. R. C. 191

THE capture of Jerusalem by the British troops may or may not be of much military importance, but it is one of those successes which can be converted into a prodigious moral gain for the victors. More than any other city in the world Jerusalem possesses both for Jews and Christians a group of peculiarly sacred associations, which were at least neutralized by the political supremacy of the Turks in Palestine. The permanent banishment of the Turks from the Holy Land and the Holy City would appeal vividly to the moral imagination of Christendom, and all people of Christian traditions would like to know whether the heathen are going to be restored and if so who favors their restoration. Do the Austrian Catholics favor it? Do the German Catholics? Do the German Protestants? These questions should be addressed publicly to Austrian and German public opinion by some conspicuous statesman of the Allies, such as President Wilson or Lloyd George; and the answer would make interesting reading—more interesting even to Jews than to Christians. For Zionism has been gathering since the war began as a great social and religious movement. Its future depends upon the future occupation of Palestine by the Jews—upon a new and permanent return of the Jews to Jerusalem. If German and Austrian Christians and Jews propose to defeat this consummation and will insist upon the possession of Palestine by the Turks, their fellow believers in other lands would like to know it.

IN the American press and to a smaller extent in American public opinion there continues to be a truly extraordinary blindness to the scope and meaning of President Wilson's war policy. The newspapers with a few honorable exceptions such as the New York Sun and the Philadelphia Ledger, have interpreted his message as practically identical in meaning with Clemenceau's recent proclamation that the Allies' only war aim is victory. They have ignored, as they did in the case of his answer to the Pope but with less excuse, his obvious policy of seeking to promote victory by restating war aims, to the achievement of which a decisive military victory might help but is not indispensable. The opposition between Clemenceau's diplomacy and that of the President is sharp and irreconcilable, and it is further emphasized by the French Premier's repudiation of the American program of international organization. Americans have every reason to recognize this difference and to congratulate themselves on the attitude assumed by their own leader. He is contributing to the ultimate settlement of the war a body of ideas, which are, indeed, the common possession of democrats throughout the world, but which belong a little more to America than to other countries, because they are rooted in America's geographical detachment and the better tradition in her past foreign policy. Americans must feel it a privilege to bring to the assistance of their Allies the raw materials, ships, munitions and soldiers absolutely necessary to the thwarting of the immediate German design against the liberty of nations. They have, however, something of more permanent value to contribute, ideals and leadership. Surely they should rejoice in having once again during a great national crisis found a leader who can relieve war of some of its loath-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

someness by keeping it subordinate to fruitful political objects.

EVIDENTLY a change is taking place in British public opinion which may before long be reflected in a change in the British ministry. Ever since the early summer of 1915 the United Kingdom has been governed by a coalition of the two major parties both of which were united in demanding the vigorous prosecution of the war. When Lloyd George succeeded Mr. Asquith many of the former Liberal leaders were omitted from the cabinet, but since their dismissal they have loyally supported the government. Now, however, a rift is beginning to appear. The Unionist Marquis of Lansdowne's letter in spite of its condemnation by Bonar Law and Robert Cecil is receiving a great deal of Liberal support. It has been approved by almost all the Liberal press, by Lord Buckmaster and by Sir Gilbert Murray. The latter's adhesion is particularly significant, because of his close association with Lord Grey. Mr. Asquith will according to public reports be found upon the same side. If these indications prove to be correct, the war policy of the Liberal party is beginning to be distinguished from the war policy of the Conservatives; and the labor party will, of course, agree and coöperate with the former. It looks as if the Lloyd George government would soon be faced with a real opposition, and as if the war policy of the new opposition would be more closely allied to President Wilson's than is that of the government. In that case what would eventually become of the government?

THE effectiveness of President Wilson's "political offensive" is indicated by the manner in which his message was received in Austria-Hungary and in Germany. Count Czernin regards the message as a step toward international understanding, and explains away the declaration of war against Austria-Hungary as a necessary consequence of the war against Germany. From Germany we have as yet no authoritative comments on the message. But the government knows what the press is doing, and the German newspapers, of whatever shade of political opinion, are denouncing the President in unison. The explanation is simple. The extreme militarists and expansionists are naturally enraged. They see in the moderateness of the President's utterances a grave menace to their influence upon Russia, their hegemony among their Allies and their control of German public opinion. In the face of so dangerous an attack, the more liberal German newspapers are forced for the time to stand shoulder to shoulder with the military extremists. There is obviously only one thing for the German publicist to do at the present juncture, and that is to make as uncompromising a war document as possible out of the President's message. But this does not prove that the President's offensive has met a check in Germany. Its final effect will be registered in the kind of terms Germany will offer in her next "peace offensive."

MANY members of Congress are now ready to admit that the war revenue measure enacted in the last session, after unending debate and unlimited time for elaboration, is a defective measure, in parts unintelligible even to the experts in tax law and administration. It is useless now to stress the fact that there was plenty of time, while the bill was under debate, to assemble the experts and to utilize their services in drafting a workable measure. The best that can now be done is to bring about a prompt revision of those features of the law—chiefly the excess profits schedule—that present serious difficulties in interpretation. The proposal that the law in its entirety should be repealed and a new law substituted is without merit, to say the best that can be said for it. There will not be time, in the present session, to work over the entire subject of revenue legislation. The law enacted in the last session was only a partial victory for democracy, but even such a victory cost immense efforts. To throw open the whole field once more would be to jeopardize the gains won in the last Congress. We have no reason for expecting that the income and the profits taxes can be raised; we have every reason for expecting that they will be whittled down. Indeed, it is difficult to escape the suspicion that the ambiguities and absurdities in the present law were allowed to pass with the definite object of bringing about a general revision in the direction of lower rates.

NO section of the country has been more seriously harassed by the baffling and insidious I. W. W. strikes than the lumber region of the Pacific Northwest. Since June and throughout a summer of abnormal demand for lumber at abnormally high prices the guerilla warfare of the I. W. W. has succeeded in cutting the output of the forests and mills in half. There has probably not been a day during the past three months when, if a few of the most influential logging operators had given the word, the states of Washington, Montana and Idaho would not have bristled with deportations and the organized lawlessness of vigilantes. Fortunately for the country the more influential operators kept their heads. Instead of simply damning the I. W. W. as incarnations of original sin, they set to work to find out the substantial causes of the industrial unrest that made

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the success of the I. W. W. propaganda possible. Instead of putting all their money into the hiring of detectives and gunmen they sought the coöperation of men like President Suzzallo and the trained economists of the University of Washington. They found that the demand for the eight-hour day was not a peculiar I. W. W. property, that it was universal among the lumberjacks. They found that the living conditions in many of the camps created genuine grievances, and that facilities for decent recreation were almost entirely lacking. They came to the statesmanlike conclusion that their best weapon against the I. W. W. propaganda was the correction of the evils which were the I. W. W. stock in trade. Acting upon this conclusion the Western Pine Association, a group of employers whose operations cover a part of western Oregon and large sections of eastern Washington, northern Idaho and western Montana, have announced the adoption of the eight-hour day and a farsighted program for dealing with the complex industrial relationships peculiar to the lumber industry of the Northwest. Both as a group and as individuals they have decided to develop an expert staff of employment managers who will give the same specialized attention to the human side of their industry which their mechanical engineers have traditionally given to the purely technical side of production. In the development of this program they are to have the active coöperation of the School of Business Administration of the University of Washington. The President's mediation commission describes the pioneer action taken by the Western Pine Association as a unique contribution toward the execution of the war program.

A COMMUNICATION from Paris to the Manchester Guardian calls attention to one highly significant fact in relation to the expenditure of the money which the German government placed at the disposal of Bolo Pasha for the purpose of corrupting the French press. It has usually been assumed that this money was devoted largely to the subsidizing of sheets which would play the German game by infecting French public opinion with pacifist poison. Such was not the case. The two newspapers with which Bolo's connection has been officially announced are the "Journal" and the "Rappel." He acquired a half interest in the "Rappel" early in 1915, and since that time it has been one of the most bellicose of the French "bitter enders," advocating the annexation to France of all German territory on the left bank of the Rhine. In the same way since the date of Bolo's connection with the "Journal," which began in January 1916 the paper has been as consistently anti-pacifist and *jusqu'auboutiste* as that of the "Rappel." In this respect the German propagandists adopted the same policy as did the Krupps before the war—the policy of subsidizing chauvinist sheets in neighboring countries for the purpose of creating a supply of foreign pugnacity with which they could feed the latent fears of the German people.

BY calling attention to the use of German money in France for the subsidizing of chauvinist papers we are far from implying that it was also used for the subsidizing of peace-at-any-price propaganda. Manifestly the Germans have as much if not more reason to undermine the spirit of resistance in foreign countries as they had to cultivate a crop of pugnacious imperialism. If a nation hostile to Germany can be divided into two armies, one of which will make any sacrifices to bring peace and the other of which will make any sacrifices to continue war, these two armies may well become more interested in fighting each other than in fighting the Germans. The struggle between pacifist and militarist Jacobinism will, if it is allowed to go far enough, be sure to shatter the nation's morale. The preservation of national unity during war depends upon a clear popular understanding and a full popular acquiescence in the political purpose for which the nation is fighting, upon an amount of military preparation sufficient to realize those purposes and finally upon the actual subordination in practice of the military machine to the political policy. It is because The New Republic has believed so devoutly in the necessity of defeating the malevolent German political ambitions that it has insisted not only on fighting German aggressors but on protesting also against any and all attempts to weaken American moral unity by an imitation in this country of Prussian militarist Jacobinism.

RAILWAY men are naturally somewhat suspicious of a government bearing gifts. Railway publicity had practically convinced the public that just now great sums of capital were required by the railways, for additional equipment, better terminal facilities and the like. Such capital was not to be had in the ordinary markets without improving railway finances through higher rates. But when it is proposed that the government find the capital through the use of its own credit the railways demur. They do not really need the billion dollars that we were given to understand they required. If they had it, they could not profitably invest it under present prices. They had almost convinced us that there is no possibility of the unification of operation essential to a state of war without a removal of the restrictions upon combination. But when the government takes the argument seriously and begins to revolve plans of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unification the railways make haste to explain that they are not asking for the abolition at this time of the anti-trust and anti-pooling provisions of the existing law. Too much reflection upon the conditions of unity might carry the government too far toward the goal of nationalization. Under the shadow of this peril the railways discover that they need very little for the present: liberation from over subtle priority entanglements, preference for necessary equipment, governmental support of the private credit of those roads that must resort to the financial markets. And higher rates; but this requirement is writ very small.

UNLESS the Reverend G. W. McPherson has been incorrectly reported by the New York Times, his attack upon Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., is rather unfair. The attack was provoked by Mr. Rockefeller's assertion that baptism by total immersion was not a necessary preliminary to membership in the Baptist Church. We do not know whether he actually said this, but even if he did it does not follow that he must also deny the infallibility of the Bible, the substitutionary atonement, the resurrection and the second coming—things which Mr. McPherson accuses him of denying. Even if Mr. Rockefeller has strayed from the right path would it not be charitable to suppose that he has been temporarily misguided by study of the Didachē, which tells us to baptize by pouring water on the head, or by contemplation of those early Christian works of art which, from the first to the tenth century, never represent the baptizee as totally immersed? And why does Mr. McPherson utter this harsh saying? "Mr. Rockefeller's hobby is the trust. It is the thing in religion he wants that made his father rich in oil." Such a remark, so unpleasing in the ideas it calls up, ought not to be made until Mr. Rockefeller, with an eye to business, reverses himself and comes out for baptism by total immersion, for all Christians of every denomination, in oil.

The Diplomacy of Publicity

THE next few weeks will decide whether the statesmen of Great Britain, France and Italy will recognize the true meaning and the necessary consequences of the President's message to Congress. The outcome of the war is now hanging in the balance. The German High Command is enabled with the troops released from the Russian front to adopt an aggressive strategy in Italy and in France. For the time being it will force the fighting and deal savage blows both at the weakest and the strongest of its enemies. It does not seek, except perhaps in Italy, to gain anything except a tactical military advantage from these onslaughts, but it does hope to impair the growing prestige and confidence of the British Army, to disable still further the Italian army and to intensify the prevailing uncertainty and discouragement of public opinion in the Allied countries. Then some time soon the German government will take advantage of its negotiations with the Bolsheviki to launch a new "peace offensive" more definite and more dangerous than any it has yet attempted.

It may go ill with the Allies should they helplessly and passively await this attack. Increasingly formidable as the German and Austrian armies have become since they were reënforced from the east, they are less formidable as a weapon than the political propaganda which is being pursued under the protection of their victories. The whole German peace campaign is now approaching the point of culmination. The Russian collapse is supplying their political strategy with its supreme opportunity. No government can apparently endure in Russia which does not actively seek peace. If the Germans offer specific terms based on the "no annexations and no indemnities" formula and including a definite promise to abandon their territorial conquests, the Russians would listen eagerly and sympathetically. They would submit such terms to the Allies, and if the proposed basis of negotiation were refused, as it would be, they could probably be detached from the great Alliance. The consequences of such a German political victory might not be all the Germans anticipate. They would be acquiring a tool which because of its unwieldiness and unmanageability might in the end make peace with Russia about as costly as war with Russia has recently been. But even though a civil conflagration resulted in Russia, the German fighting power in the west would be enormously and permanently enhanced, and the price of a military victory on the part of the Allies correspondingly increased.

Ever since last May the threat to the success of the Allies which resulted from the increasing indisposition of Russia to fight has been steadily gathering and becoming more ominous. What President Wilson thinks of the diplomacy with which the threat has been handled is sufficiently evident from the reference to the matter in his message. If, he says, the Allies had trusted more to the "tides" of democracy "which run now in the hearts and consciences of free men everywhere" "the sympathy and enthusiasm of the Russian people might have been once for all enlisted on the side of the Allies, suspicion and distrust swept away and a real and lasting union of purpose effected." In this passage Mr. Wilson has called attention to the gravest weakness of the anti-German alliance. It has neglected to effect a real and lasting union of political purpose and it remains

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consequently dangerously exposed to the political attacks of a more united enemy. In the present situation, this genuine union of purpose can be effected only by the speedy emphatic endorsement by all the Allied governments of Mr. Wilson's definition of war aims and his use of war diplomacy.

The last official definition of what the European associates of this country are fighting for was made, it will be remembered, in response to President Wilson's request of December 22nd, of last year. The request itself was originally interpreted in France and England as a pro-German manoeuvre and those Americans who sustained the President were treated by the people who disagreed with them as little short of German accomplices. Yet the result of the President's intervention was beneficial to the cause of the Allies. He exposed and defeated the duplicity of the first German peace initiative. The Allies could afford to be much more candid about what they were fighting for than could the Germans, and they wisely took advantage of their opportunity. Their statement of January 12th, 1916, contained certain ambiguous and dubious passages, but its support of the project of a league of nations and its friendliness to national and more popular aspirations provided a sufficient basis for America's subsequent adhesion to the cause of the Allies.

As Lord Lansdowne has pointed out, however, many essential conditions have changed since the definition of last January. The United States has entered the war and has placed its resources unreservedly at the service of the European associates. Unlike the other belligerents, it has offered its services without driving any bargain as to the political purposes for the fulfilment of which its war contributions should be made to count. Its government has publicly and repeatedly defined its own political program and it has trusted to its Allies to answer in kind and to remove the ambiguities from their last public proclamation of aims. By so doing it tried to bring into existence a new form in international association, a League of Honor, based not upon a joint distribution and guaranty of special national benefits, but upon a joint attempt to promote a common international program. It has also brought into existence a new form of international diplomacy based not on secret agreements, but upon the frankest possible appeal to popular understanding and support throughout the world. As President Wilson himself has said, "It is in the full disclosing light of that thought (the thought of the plain people here and everywhere throughout the world) that all policies must be conceived and executed in this midday hour of the world's life"; and by insisting on the democratic diplomacy of full publicity President Wilson has only been seeking to provide a foundation in the method and spirit of international negotiation and intercourse for the permanent emergence by America from its traditional isolation. The American people cannot be depended upon permanently to underwrite any settlement of the war which rests rather upon the indefinite employment of armed force than upon the willing and well informed consent of all the peoples. Great Britain, France and Italy have not as yet squared either their program or their diplomacy with this declaration of the President. Until they join with him in seeking to obtain for the Allied cause the acquiescence of the "daily more audible, more articulate and more persuasive" "voices of humanity" that condemn vindictive political action and program and demand publicity of diplomatic method, the moral endurance of the anti-German combination will be impaired by the lack of a "lasting union of purpose."

Another sufficient reason for a new definition of the war aims of the western Powers is provided by radical alterations in the European political and military situation which the Russian revolution has brought with it. The territorial readjustments in central Europe and the Balkans, proposed in the note of last January, involving as they did the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the creation of several new independent Slavic states, would at least for the next twenty-five years need the support of the Russian army and of a Russian military preponderance in southeastern Europe. Now that Russian armies can no longer be invoked for the maintenance of such an arrangement, some new method must be devised of removing the danger to the peace of the world, which arises from the suppressed national aspirations of the Bohemian and the South Slavs. Will they not be obliged eventually to fall back upon the policy indicated by the President—the policy, apparently, of tempting the Austrians and Hungarians to avoid the disagreeable alternative of being subjugated either by their German allies or by their enemies in the only way such a fate can be avoided—that is by granting to the Bohemians and South Slavs as large a measure of autonomy as the Hungarians now enjoy. The President is only trying to take diplomatic advantage of the Austrian-Hungarian's craving for peace, just as the Germans are taking advantage of the Russian craving for peace. He is only trying to make diplomacy supplement the work of the armies in winning the war.

But in addition to these new conditions which demand on the part of the western Powers a new definition of their political purposes, there is a final reason for such an action which is more pressing and more convincing than all the others. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

German government is now in a wholly different situation from that with which it was faced a year ago. Instead of refusing to state its aims, it will now be obliged, as a consequence of its negotiations with Russia, to define the terms on which it will make a general peace; and in naming these terms it will seek to go far enough to satisfy the Russians and at the same time to fall short of satisfying the western Powers. If it can succeed in this manoeuvre, it will have snatched from the Allies the advantage of political position with which they started the war and to which they are fully entitled on the merits. The Allies on their side will be presenting the Germans with a long start in the race for the friendship of the Russian nation and the ability to influence its national policy, the issue of which will do so much to determine the future balance of political forces in eastern Europe. They will be risking the sympathy of those popular tides of opinion which are becoming such a powerful but such an uncertain element in the calculations of statesmen. They cannot afford to be placed in so inflexible and compromising a position and it is not too late to avoid the danger. The German "peace offensive" has not as yet culminated. It is still separated by several weeks from its goal. The President's counter-offensive has already resulted in a significant postponement of the negotiations between Russia and Germany for a truce. By advancing speedily and whole-heartedly to the President's assistance, they will not only avoid the ugly penalties which they will have to pay for permitting themselves to be manoeuvred into an untenable position, but they will be traveling the best road which still remains open to win for their cause an ultimate and permanent victory.

Take Over the Railroads

THE railways must be operated as a unit. Their efficiency must not be impaired by conflict of interest between the several carriers. It must not be impaired by the application of laws, state or federal, that may have made for the protection of the public in time of peace, but that indisputably make for national impotence in time of war. On the urgent necessity of unification the Interstate Commerce Commission is in agreement with the railway presidents, and all well informed students of the railway problem heartily concur. The only question at issue is one of method. Shall unification be attained through the assumption by the government of the operation of the railway system, or through action of the carriers themselves, under authority of new laws to be enacted permitting pooling, and abolishing the right of the states to intervene in the regulation of railway traffic as it exists within their borders?

Whether the railways are to remain under private ownership or are ultimately to become a government enterprise is one of the vital questions of American politics of the future. It is a question upon which the opposing opinions are already intense, often bitter. Accordingly it is natural that men should permit their views on the present railway crisis to be colored by their preferences as to the ultimate disposition of the railways. Those who regard public ownership as an unmixed good are predisposed to favor the immediate assumption of railway operation by the government. Those who regard public ownership as an unmitigated evil are inclined to the alternative of unification under private control. But it is the business of every loyal American to draw a sharp distinction between war measures and peace measures. We have already had too much of the tendency to harness the national interest in war to interests of private gain or partisan advantage. If we are to take over the railways as a war measure, let us do it solely because we can thereby meet our war requirements more satisfactorily than in any other way. Let us make up our minds to play fair on the return of peace, restoring each separate interest in the railway field to exactly the position it would have held if war had not enforced any new form of governmental intervention. And if, on full consideration of the whole railway situation, we find it expedient to effect unification through private agencies released from the restrictions of federal and state law, let us make up our minds that the arrangement shall end with the war, leaving the railways precisely where they would have been if the arrangement had never been made. If we can hold to this obvious principle of patriotism and political honesty, the choice between the alternative methods of unification becomes simply a matter of technical and legislative convenience.

In the first place, what differences do the two methods present in the matter of actual operation? None whatever. Whether the roads are privately pooled, or operated directly by the government, we should have to avail ourselves of the services of their present personnel. Railway presidents and traffic managers and the whole host of officials and employees would remain in either case precisely where they are, receiving the same salaries and enjoying the same discretionary powers, except for a certain amount of shifting about with a view to placing the ablest men in the most important posts. Such shifting about could not be revolutionary in character, since the distribution of posts according to ability has been well managed under private operation. In either case rolling stock would be quite thoroughly pooled, cars and locomotives being

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assigned to the several roads according to traffic requirements. In either case division of labor between the roads would be carried farther than is now possible. The road with the best gradients and shortest line would take more than its proportionate share of low grade, but vitally important freight—coal, live stock, wheat—and surrender to the longer and more difficult tracks more than their proportionate share of the higher and more profitable freight.

In the second place, what of the interests of the holders of stocks and bonds in the several roads? Whether the roads are privately pooled or taken over by the government, those interests will require a preliminary definition, and satisfaction out of common earnings. It is conceivable that in the general interest most of the paying freight ought to be diverted from a particular road. But investors in that road ought not to be permitted to suffer particularly in the general interest. If the railroads are taken over by the government, the investors in each road will have to be assured interest and dividends sufficient to meet their reasonable expectations. If the railroads are simply pooled, interest will have to be assured out of the common earnings and dividends proportionate to the reasonable expectations of earnings under competitive management. The difference is not material. Interest and dividends assured by the government would fall short of the maximum possible under a pooling arrangement, but would present the compensating advantage of stability. And stability is a valued consideration in war time.

Down to this point we have found practically no margin of preference between the two methods of unification. Indifference disappears the moment we consider questions of rates and service. Under government operation rates might be advanced or service reduced without involving any question of private profits. The public would not murmur, if rates were advanced fifteen per cent or twenty-five, if it were assured that such an advance was determined solely with a view to the national interest. The public is naturally restive under advances that are likely to issue in nothing more than increased dividends. We may waive the question whether raising railway dividends is really a war necessity. Too many persons confuse their private interests with the national war necessities to leave in the public mind a serene confidence in the justice of the claim for higher dividends. The public is restive under the curtailment of railway service. The nation at war cannot afford the waste of the numerous passenger trains of peace times, but the public is aware that reduction in passenger service has a favorable influence upon private railway earnings. Again we waive the question whether the influence is unduly favorable. Popular suspicion of interested motives, however groundless, is an evil. It can be extirpated under government operation. It cannot be extirpated under private pooling.

We come now to the legislative aspect of the question. Here, it can hardly be disputed, the advantages of the method of governmental assumption are overwhelming. All that is required is a simple act of Congress authorizing the President to take over the roads for the period of the war. Neither the federal courts nor those of the states would dispute for one moment the power of the nation at war to assume unlimited control of such means of transportation as it might designate, whether operating across state lines or within the states. But to endow with similar powers an association of private corporations, such as a national railway pool, would be a legislative problem of extreme complexity.

Congress can relieve the railways from the operation of the Sherman anti-trust act and the provisions against pooling in the Interstate Commerce law. Can it abolish the anti-trust and anti-pooling provisions of all the states, in so far as they apply to traffic within their borders? Can it deprive the states of their power to regulate rates and service of the traffic that does not cross state lines? Possibly it can. There is good reason for believing that the American people will finally make up their minds to accept the principle that the power to regulate interstate railway traffic can be wholly effective only when it is supplemented by the power to regulate railway traffic within the states. They have not yet made up their minds to accept this principle. They will approach it only through a slow process of legal development. To attempt to force it upon them at this time, even if the attempt succeeded, would be to seize upon a war emergency to advance a partisan interest that is still a minority interest.

If we adopt the method of governmental operation for the period of the war we can secure all the traffic advantages that we could secure under unified private operation. We can assure justice to railway investors without encountering the friction or arousing the popular suspicion that the satisfaction of investors' claims under private pooling would entail. We can attain the end of unification without raising legislative and constitutional questions which ought not be raised to disturb us at this time. At the close of the war we can return to the status quo ante—something that would be impossible if we removed at this time all the legal obstacles in the way of unification under private control.

But would we wish to return to the status quo ante, having tasted of the benefits of nationaliza-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion? This is the real kernel in the opposition to government assumption of the railways. All we can know now is that if government operation proves as inefficient as its opponents claim, our present experiment will strengthen the opposition to nationalization as a permanent policy. If government operation works well, the effect upon public opinion will be the contrary. Whether we favor or oppose nationalization, we ground our views in the national interest. Why then should we shrink from putting them to the test in so far as any test is now practicable?

National Labor Exchanges

WAR has made the adoption of a better system of finding employment for labor a matter of national self-preservation. The industrial production required to support the armies and navies are being hampered by the demoralized condition of the labor market. Ships and more ships are needed; yet their builders are clamoring for men. Munitions in huge quantities are ordered; yet employers are crying "labor shortage." Food supplies must be forthcoming; yet the effective man power is not. The situation is finally being recognized as far too serious for half measures. Pennsylvania's Governor and War Board have already set aside $25,000 a month for the publicly organized work of labor placement. The United States must follow suit. Having failed in this vital aspect of industrial organization in peace times, it cannot escape the acute necessity of providing as a matter of war efficiency a comprehensive mechanism for the better distributing of its workers.

"Labor shortage is a myth," says Charles B. Barnes, Director of the New York State Employment Bureau, and President of the American Association of Public Employment Officials. "On a certain day about the first of November, an article appeared in hundreds of newspapers, telling that 400,000 workers were needed in shipyards," he reported at the conference on labor problems held recently by the State Industrial Commission at Syracuse. "About three days after this there appeared in the New York Times a triple-headed article to the effect that the Port Newark Terminal shipyard needed 12,000 men and requested all men able to do work in this line to *give up their jobs* and go to the shipyards. On reading this article I first ascertained that our New York office had on that day between four hundred and five hundred men who were capable of doing work of this kind. I called up the United States Emergency Fleet corporation and got their employment manager. On stating that we were ready to send them men, I was informed that they did not need any men. When I quoted the newspaper article he said it was exaggerated. I then offered to send him a few skilled men in certain specific lines, which brought out the fact that he was troubled by personal requests of workers at the gates, and that he actually had over four thousand registrations on his books, and was turning away men every day. This is but a single example, but we can duplicate it in every office throughout the state."

It is the lack of machinery for intelligent and effective distribution of labor rather than a dearth of labor, it appears, that is responsible for the present crisis. The first proposal for an adequate remedy is found in the bill introduced into Congress last week to create a federal Employment Service. By extending and unifying all labor exchange activities of the government and giving them an independent organization in the Department of Labor, in charge of a director appointed by the President, the bill provides for the centralized control, clearly defined functions and uniformity of policy that are the first essentials of efficiency. But a system of labor exchange on a unified nation-wide scale must depend for success upon the close coöperation of local bureaus in immediate touch with the details of employers' needs and of the labor supply. To this end the federal government is asked to grant financial aid, "dollar for dollar," to the state and city public employment bureaus which would join forces with the national service—a potent inducement. If the bill is passed it will achieve a three-fold purpose; the mobilization of our labor population for war strength, the reabsorption of the fighting men into industry without chaos and the continued stabilization of the labor supply to meet the growing industrial requirements of the future. Such a service, the American Federation points out, is not only an "invaluable adjunct to our war machinery," but is "keenly needed in the transition period that will follow the declaration of peace and the work of demobilization."

The flagrant inadequacy of past attempts to deal with the employment problem was never more vividly revealed than in the unemployment crisis of 1913-14—all too soon forgotten! Only in time of depression does the public become interested and then all efforts are directed toward temporary relief, leaving practically no opportunity for constructive work. Since the American Association for Labor Legislation called the first national conference on unemployment in New York three years ago, when a resolution was adopted recommending such a federal system as is proposed in the bill now before Congress, there have been scattering efforts in states and cities to provide at least sectional re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lief. But no machinery capable of meeting the country's requirements has been developed. How far the United States is lagging behind other nations in this respect was suggested by members of the British Munitions Board, on their recent visit to this country, when they announced that England is planning to increase the number of her public employment bureaus from four hundred to two thousand, which is ten times as many as there are in the United States with double the population. No wonder both the Labor Adjustment Committee of the Shipping Board and the high officials in the Labor Department are insisting on the need of passing the proposed legislation. The national need is arousing us to a long neglected national duty.

"Too Much Unionism"

IF anyone should tell the President that one of the largest employers of labor in the United States not only is hostile to the unions of his workers but is using his great influence to have their right to organize forbidden by Congress, Mr. Wilson would probably be angry. If one should then go on to say that this employer had granted no increases in wages for ten years, that he made no provision for superannuated employees, that he allowed no sick-leave, that he gave no extra pay for night work, that he summarily discharged officers of unions who published their grievances, that he would not answer their petitions or consult with them, that he refused delegates leave of absence to attend national conventions of their associations, that he sought to prevent them from presenting their grievances to Congress or influencing legislators through any channel except himself, the President might justly call him an intolerable autocrat. Yet all these charges are made, many of them with unimpeachable evidence, against the executive of a national industry employing hundreds of thousands of men and women scattered through every city and village in the country. They are made against a member of Mr. Wilson's Cabinet, Postmaster General Burleson.

The administration has taken the position, not once but many times, that organized labor must be recognized, that whatever its grievances they must be heard and adjudicated, that employees and employers should "meet across the table" and adjust their differences. Provision for adjustment boards containing labor representatives have been required of almost all private employers signing contracts with the War and Navy Departments since last April. Such commissions are in operation under the Shipping Board. The government is making every effort to extend the principle.

There are in the postal service unions organized under permission granted by act of Congress on August 24th, 1912. The act did not grant public employees the right to strike, but it did permit them to present their grievances to Congress, and to affiliate with outside organizations, so long as that affiliation involved no obligation to strike. The postal unions are now asking, rightly or wrongly, for wage increases and changes in working conditions. They have sent to Mr. Burleson, whose duty it is to make recommendations to Congress concerning his department, petitions embodying their requests. These petitions, they state, have not even been acknowledged. The unions have sent delegations to talk over the matter with him. The deputations have not been received. The last committee was turned away unheard on December fifth.

Mr. Burleson has made but one answer to the unions' pleas. It is contained in four pages of his annual report. He accuses the union officers of presenting "imaginary grievances," "distorting or misrepresenting the facts," and undermining discipline. For these statements he gives no concrete evidence. He writes: "These organizations hold national and state conventions, and some publish journals. The time of these conventions and the space in these journals are devoted almost entirely to matters of selfish interests." This seems to him an offense, and he proceeds to lecture the unions on the duty of unselfishness. The unions had pointed out that postal wages had not been raised for ten years, in spite of the fact that Congress in its last session increased the pay of other civil service employees, and that there had been a general and marked rise in wages to meet the increased cost of living. To this Mr. Burleson replies quite simply that postal employees are getting enough—since their compensation is three times that of soldiers. This comparison is the only evidence he offers on the subject of wages. He omits to report that postal employees cannot, like soldiers, live in government barracks, wear government clothes and eat government food. Mr. Burleson goes on to say that postal employees, since their affiliation with the American Federation of Labor, "have become bold," and that they may, some time in the future, strike. According to him a few did indeed strike in one instance, by "tendering their resignations and leaving the service in a body." This he regards as a revolutionary "menace to our government"; and he reports that he had the offenders prosecuted in the courts. (The unions state that the men who resigned were not members of organizations.)

Mr. Burleson does not plead that Congress, not he, is primarily responsible for the wages of civil servants; rather he asks to be allowed to assume

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the whole responsibility. "If by combining government employees are enabled to unduly influence Members of Congress and others seeking election to public office, the situation will inevitably arise, if it has not already arisen, where Congress will be unduly influenced by such combinations. . . ." He therefore recommends that the act permitting employees to organize and present grievances to Congress be repealed. He comes to the conclusion that the whole trouble is due to "too much unionism."

Mr. Burleson does show a faint appreciation of the danger that someone may find a discrepancy between his labor policy and President Wilson's. But he rests his case on the argument that whereas other workers may have to "protect themselves against the selfishness of private employers," his subordinates are working for "the government, whose officers are merely executing the will of the people." "They can always depend upon public opinion to insure their enjoyment of their full rights under their employment." It may be unfair to suggest that the selfishness of a private employer can be paralleled by the desire of a government official to show a large profit, or by his narrow view of what is just. But it is not unfair to ask how an official can be sure he is dealing justly with employees if he refuses to confer with their representatives, or how, failing just treatment by him, they can depend on public opinion if they are not allowed to present their case before its legislative organ. One is somewhat at a loss to know exactly how public opinion could exert any influence on Mr. Burleson. The unions even declare that a number of their officials were dismissed for insubordination because they expressed public disapproval of the Postmaster General's policy.

It is not the present intention to inquire into the merits of whatever specific grievances the postal employees may happen to have. Perhaps they are all insubstantial. It is not argued that government employees should be granted the right to strike. But shall Mr. Burleson's acknowledged attitude be allowed to set a precedent for labor policy in government-owned utilities? This is a question of more than passing interest. Congress may in the near future think it advisable for the government to take over the telegraphs and telephones, the railroads, and perhaps the mines. England has already found it necessary to do so. But such extension of the government's power might indeed lead to revolution if it meant that the unions involved must disband, and that representatives of the employees could neither confer with executive officials, inform the public of their grievances, nor exert pressure on the legislature. Such industrial slavery would not now be tolerated by the American people. The fact that a high official should for a moment consider it desirable throws light on his fitness to continue as one of the responsible representatives of an administration which is endeavoring to impress the world with its democratic intentions.

Taxation vs. Loans Once More

REVISION of our war tax laws will not be undertaken at the current session of Congress, with the possible exception of the removal of a few inconsistencies and absurdities, like the eight per cent excess profits tax on personal incomes. For another year, then, we are committed to a war revenue system whose chief reliance consists in the flotation of loans. Are we content with this situation? The New Republic early adopted the view that the war ought to be financed, so far as practicable, by taxation. Conscription of income appeared to us a logical concomitant of conscription of men. While the war revenue bill was under debate, we consistently urged higher rates on incomes, excess profits and luxurious expenditures. The act as passed appeared to us altogether too weak in its taxation features. It contemplated the issue of bonds greatly exceeding the volume that would have been required had the taxation provisions been more drastic. The New Republic had argued that inflation was the inevitable consequence of bond issues; that extravagant increase in the national debt would emphasize the inequalities in the distribution of wealth. Nevertheless, with the loan policy adopted, The New Republic has worked unremittingly for the success of the loan issues.

Does this mean that we have abandoned our former preference for taxation instead of loans? Many of our friends think it does. We do not ourselves admit that there is any inconsistency whatever in our preference for taxation and our support of bond issues. If the conscription bill had failed and the country were endeavoring to raise an army by volunteering, we should have retained our preference for conscription while working with all our energy for the successful raising of a volunteer army. The essential thing was an army. We preferred to have it raised by the simplest and fairest method: if Congress had rejected that method, any alternative method that promised an army would have commanded our undivided allegiance. What is essential in war finance is that the government possess the means to provide our armies with all the material they can profitably use. We should view with horror the sacrifice of divisions of American soldiers rendered inevitable by lack of sufficient guns and shells. Rather than that,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

let the government lay hands upon purchasing power by taxation or bond issues, by fiat money or by physical confiscation, if need be.

But if the bond issues were a failure, would not the government be driven to resort to taxation? Yes, but time would be lost, and we have no time to lose. It is vital to the national honor and safety that our soldiers, when they reach the firing line, shall be equipped and munitioned according to the highest known standards. It is not less vital that they shall reach the firing line at the earliest possible date. In war, time is always to be reckoned with as an ally of the enemy. The money needed now to equip our armies and convey them to the front is to be had only through loans. Therefore we, together with all other Americans who give their unqualified support to the war policy of our government are bound to give the war loans unqualified support. We should owe such support even if we believed that the ultimate social effects of a loan policy were irremediably evil.

But The New Republic does not believe in irremediable evils. Democracy may be forced back many leagues, but sooner or later it reaches a position where it can make a stand, and eventually administer defeat to the enemy. Democracy was beaten on the war revenue bill, but not so thoroughly as might have been anticipated. The war tax on incomes remained too low, but it was placed at a level higher than any income tax in the world before the war. Even today it is surpassed only by the British tax. The excess profits tax was placed too low. But nobody dreamed, two years ago, of so high a tax as the one now actually in force. The power of democracy, in the contest over the war revenue bill, proved so great that its ultimate victory can be safely predicted, provided that it develops the necessary endurance.

If the war had been financed through taxation alone, the financial burden would of necessity have fallen chiefly upon the more fortunate classes. The general tendency of such a financial policy would have been to reduce the inequalities of fortune that give rise to grave concern among all friends of democracy. If the war had been financed wholly through loans, the chief burden would have fallen upon the poor. At the close of the war much the greater proportion of the bonds would have been held by the wealthier classes, and their claim to interest would have been met by taxes of general incidence, falling mainly upon the poor. For the rich, if they had been able in war to resist the imposition of income and profits taxation, would certainly have been able to resist such taxation in peace.

The democracy has accepted the principle of a great national war debt; and, however widely the bonds may be held, it is inevitable that after the war the greater part will be found in the hands of the wealthy. But the democracy has also succeeded in imposing taxes falling directly upon the wealthy, which are quite capable of yielding revenues sufficient to pay interest on the debt and gradually to sink it altogether. Herein lies democracy's opportunity to wipe out its original defeat. Let it insist that the income and profits taxes be retained on the statute books until the war debt is extinguished.

Most of the war debt will be an asset of the wealthy classes after the war. Very well; the taxes that pay interest and amortization on the war debt will be liabilities of the wealthy classes if the democracy is resolute in its purposes.

It is not to be denied that arduous efforts will be required of the democracy to keep the burden of the war debt upon those classes that would have borne the chief burden of taxation if we had adopted a more democratic policy of financing the war. Upon the return of peace we may anticipate a powerful movement to reduce the income and profits taxes. Our imports will again assume an imposing volume, and persistent efforts will be made to levy such heavy customs duties—in the imaginary interest of American production—that our treasury will not need the produce of the direct taxes. But the recent struggle over the income and profits taxes shows that the democracy is alive to its interests in the fiscal field. Can it be enlisted for the long campaign for the extinction of the debt through income and profits taxation? We believe that it can, and that at the present time it is much wiser for the friends of democracy to make preparations for that campaign than to work against the tide for a reopening at the present Congress of the question of taxation.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1917, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS
HERBERT CROLY FRANCIS HACKETT
PHILIP LITTELL ALVIN JOHNSON
GEORGE SOULE—Assistant Editor
CHARLES MERZ, Washington Representative

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE: REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Down the River"

THE War College building in Washington is three miles "down the river" from the War Department building. This apparently insignificant fact is really one of the large facts in the conduct of the war. It has consequences, daily, of a most far-reaching sort. And its largeness and importance would be generally recognized and discussed if we were in the habit of following that highly technical enterprise, war, with one-tenth of the general popular interest and intelligence with which we follow that other highly technical enterprise, baseball.

One reason, and a great reason, why baseball is well played in this country is that every distinguished player, as he steps up to bat or throws to first, knows that millions of eyes are turned toward him in what the President calls a "grave scrutiny." He knows that success will bring applause and that a strike-out or a wild throw will be noted and severely reprobated at supper in every hamlet between New York and San Francisco. He knows, too, that every tiniest technical trick of his, in deluding a pitcher or in trapping a runner on bases, has the instant technical appreciation of, at a modest computation, ten million highly trained fans. The result is that he is up on his toes every minute. Every minute is glory or disgrace. From this standpoint the people who gather in the streets in front of newspaper offices and watch the scores getting chalked up or flashed out are a very considerable part of the efficiency of the national game. They might not be able to stop a grounder but they help grounders to be stopped.

In such a spirit, a spirit of great humility, I approach the subject of the War Department. The gentlemen who play out the great game of war in that department are inadequately appreciated and, on occasion, inadequately credited with strike-outs and errors; because their organization, among themselves, and their various responsibilities have not usually found any genuinely responsive interest in the minds of those of us who are onlookers. They have lived in an obscurity which for Ty Cobb would have been very depressing, and more than depressing, slackening.

Now, with war, a great change has come, or will come, must come. The ideal would be if General Sharpe, on opening his newspaper in the morning, should see himself in a box-score credited with one error and three hits. He is bound to make errors. Napoleon himself, as Quartermaster General of the United States Army, would make errors. This article, and ensuing articles, dealing with organization in the War Department, are written in full realization of that fact. But they are also written in full realization of a certain other fact: namely,—that personal responsibility has to be located somewhere, and that some people are standing up under it, and other people are not standing up under it, and that it is extremely unjust to throw a blanket of equal unconcern and of equal praise over good work and bad work together, and that it is no loyalty to our government but, on the contrary, a form of really cowardly and criminal disloyalty, to stand at applause in the face of things that may mean a horrible prolongation of the war and a horrible unnecessary sacrifice of life.

In one of the battles on the British front, in the beginning of the war, two divisions were shot to shreds because, simply, an error had been made, a slight error, in the highly complicated and extraordinarily difficult technical task of issuing clear orders from headquarters. It was a case of "bad staff work." The British have been compelled to get good staff work and they have been compelled to get a good General Staff at home and they have now reached the point of being able to compete on even terms with the German General Staff, and they have done it under the pressure of a public opinion outspoken to a degree which no American can realize unless he is an habitual reader of the British newspapers and magazines.

The point of departure, the point of start, in an appreciation of the War Department is clearly the General Staff, of which the War College is a part. And here it is most gratifying to be able to begin by saying that, in this matter, in the matter of preserving the powers and the possibilities of the General Staff, which has to be the army's calculating brain, Mr. Newton D. Baker has performed an act entitling him to thunders of applause, which, however, because of our general lack of interest in the essentials of war, he has not generally got. That act of his has passed very widely unregarded. But it should always be remembered for him. It was a great act, really worthy to be called historic.

Congress, in the National Defense law of last year, used language which might easily have been construed, and which was by many people actually construed, to cripple the General Staff. Congress, by nature, is inclined toward a strengthening of the various non-staff bureaus of the War Department, such as the Quartermaster General's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

office, the Adjutant General's office, the Judge Advocate General's office, the Ordnance office, the Inspector General's office, the Signal Corps office, the Engineer's office, and so on; and it is by nature inclined to weaken the General Staff or, at any rate, to push it to one side. There is a good reason. The bureaus, many of them, deal with things in which Congress is vastly interested, such as the placing of people and the placing of contracts. The severely intellectual pursuits of the General Staff do not thrill Congress and, moreover, they tend to bring a new impersonal technical influence to bear upon established personal bureau routine. Certain bureau chiefs in the past have known very well how to charm Congress with the bureau idea and how to leave it lukewarm about the staff idea.

There was once an Adjutant General who was magnificent at this sort of politics. He was a busy man, but if Congressman Smith wanted to know did his great-great-great-grandfather fight at the Battle of Bennington, nothing interfered with finding that out. The inquirer, if he was a Congressman or a Senator, was always put, by orders, straight on the General's phone and "*I*," said the General, "*I* will find out." A clerk laboriously did. And then, a few days later, the Congressman, back on the phone, heard the General say: "*I* have found out that your great-great-great-grandfather did indeed fight at the Battle of Bennington, most heroically. You are indeed a Son of the American Revolution. And I am sending you all the papers myself." Decades of such amenities, decades of acquaintanceships and favors, built up for the bureaus a tremendous Congressional strength, which still, largely, continues. And therefore, even in the National Defense act, in the course of ostensibly, and, in many respects, actually, improving our military organization. Congress made for itself an opportunity to strike at the General Staff and it did so most particularly in a section containing the words "Hereafter members of the General Staff Corps shall not be permitted to assume or engage in work of an administrative nature that pertains to established Bureaus."

This section at once became the theme of a very able legal opinion by General Crowder, Judge Advocate General. If his views had been accepted by Mr. Baker (and he is Mr. Baker's legal military adviser), we should now have only the phantom of a General Staff. General Crowder held that the General Staff could indeed give itself to the "study of military problems" and to "the preparation of plans for the national defense" and to "investigating and reporting upon the efficiency and state of preparedness of the military forces of the United States for service in peace or war." But the original General Staff law of 1903, passed under the influence of Elihu Root, had also said that the officers of the General Staff should "render professional aid and assistance to the Secretary of War" and should act as his "agents" in the delicate but most necessary task of "informing and coördinating the action of all the different officers who are subject, under the terms of this act, to the supervision of the Chief of Staff." And who were those officers? The law of 1903 named them in defining the powers of the Chief of Staff. It said:

"The Chief of Staff, under the direction of the President or of the Secretary of War, shall have supervision of all troops of the line and of the Adjutant General's, Inspector General's, Judge Advocate's, Quartermaster's, Subsistence, Medical, Pay, and Ordnance Departments, the Corps of Engineers, and the Signal Corps." The Chief of Staff was to have "supervision" of all of them. But what is "supervision"? What is "supervision" when Congress, subsequently, in the National Defense law, has said that the officers of the General Staff, of whom the Chief of Staff is one, shall not, in supervising, do any administering?

General Crowder was quite clear about it. He said:

"Unmistakably Congress has sought to preserve *untouched* the special jurisdiction of each of the several bureaus." "It is the effect of the language, and must therefore have been the purpose, of the act, to *re-establish* the relation of the several bureau chiefs as special aids and advisers to the Secretary of War, on matters which fall within their special jurisdiction, *uninterfered with by any outside agency*." "In all matters falling within the special jurisdiction of the several bureaus, Congress has said in effect that the views of the particular bureau chiefs shall govern the Secretary, so far as his own judgment is to be advised." And if there should be any "zones of uncertainty" between the powers of the bureaus and the powers of the General Staff, "the statute establishes for us a guiding rule, which is that *in case of doubt the presumption is conclusive against the General Staff.*" Such was the spirit of General Crowder's opinion, the spirit of an unusually able and highly sincere and hardworking and patriotic bureau chief.

Nevertheless the experience of the whole world in this war turns out to be that it is necessary to have a strong and really powerful General Staff. Mr. Baker essentially over-ruled General Crowder's opinion. There are times, one sees, when it is not a bad thing at all to have a lawyer for Secretary of War. A layman might have been paralyzed by the spectacle of the vivid wording of the Na-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional Defense law and of the opinion of the Judge Advocate General. Mr. Baker looked at that torrent, observed sundry cakes of floating ice on it, and leaped on them lightly from shore to shore with the General Staff safe in his arms. It was an agile performance.

Mr. Baker reviewed the origin of the General Staff. He found that it was the intent of Elihu Root, "one of the great Secretaries of War of modern times," to give to the Chief of Staff a power of supervision really effective. He found that Elihu Root had said that he was providing for a control to be exercised over the whole military arm of the government "through a single military expert of high rank." He found that such also was the legislative intent of the words that Congress was brought to use in the law of 1903. And the National Defense law of 1916 did not expressly repeal the law of 1903. Therefore all that remained was to define the word "administrative." Congress seemed to wish to prevent the General Staff from becoming too "administrative." Well, Elihu Root himself, strong as he was for a strong General Staff, never wanted the General Staff to be "administrative" at all. He said so, expressly. The General Staff is to "inform" and "coördinate" and "supervise." That is all. But that is enough. For how can it "inform" and "coördinate" and "supervise" the bureaus unless it goes into them deeply enough to equip itself with the "qualifying information"? (A splendid point that.) And therefore "it is my opinion that it is not only appropriate but necessary for the Chief of the General Staff *to pursue, with as great detail as his judgment dictates, the execution of policies throughout the several bureaus.*" And, in short, "the policy of the War Department will remain as before."

By that decision Mr. Baker took us into the war with a General Staff still capable, by law, in principle, of being a General Staff, fully. It was an act of superb insight and courage, comparable to the act performed by Lloyd George when he over-ruled the gun-policy of the British War Office, and bought bigger guns and more guns than the War Office wanted, and was, by present military consent, utterly right.

So the principle stands. But the practice is a rather different thing. Here the first fact is that stretch of three miles between the War Department and the War College, between the body of the army and the bulk of its "informing" and "coördinating" and "supervising" brain. The results are strange.

The Chief of Staff, to begin with, is separated from most of his staff. He sits in the War Department. Four of the six committees into which the General Staff is divided are resident in the War College. The picture of the Chief of Staff sitting in the midst of his staff devising great plans is an imaginary picture. It does not happen. In fact, the Chief of Staff may express an opinion on a certain highly important matter and shortly afterwards be handed an opinion from his own War College in the directly contrary sense.

The next result is that the task of doing any effective personal friendly "supervising" of the execution of policies recommended from the War College becomes peculiarly difficult. The War College man who has recommended something, after studying it, cannot readily follow it, after its acceptance, into the bureau which is operating it and make friends there and help it along with fresh suggestions out of his studies. It may be working well. It may be working badly. His faculties for knowing, and for helping, become very poor.

The third result is more serious still. Officers in the War Department in their several bureaus are every day deciding things which they know ought, in principle, to be studied by the General Staff, but "Send it 'down the river'? Never. How do we know when we'd get it back? It's a beastly out-of-the-way place, and it's two miles by carrier-pigeon, and we haven't any carrier-pigeons, and it's three miles by trolley and foot, and it takes too long, and this stuff would go to some fellow we don't know, and he might sit on it for weeks, and let's do it ourselves right here." And they do it themselves right there. They talk about "down the river" as if it were a morgue.

And the officers "down the river" have behaved as if they more or less agreed with them. When the war broke out, they made a sort of mass rush to try to get into the field. General Kuhn, who was head of the War College, and in whose mind, if anywhere, the totality of our war plans might be assumed to lie, went as soon as possible and took command of an individual training-camp. Of the forty-two officers who were his colleagues on the General Staff on April 24th of this year, twenty-eight have now vanished. Being "the brain of the army" seemed to them to be a good job to leave—a point of view that might provide considerable astonishment to Ludendorff. The German General Staff is a terrifically immediate thing in its impact on the war. Our General Staff is still regarded by our own officers as a remote thing. And the distance from the War Department to the War College is a symbol of that remoteness.

Out of such a situation, in practice, one might expect great delays in comprehensive planning and great delays also in really comprehensive executing. Subsequent articles will show that we get them.

WILLIAM HARD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Counsel of Humility

I HAVE recently received a letter from an Englishman, which may, perhaps, interest other people as much as it has interested me. I must conceal his name but the name is not essential. He is speaking less for himself than for a class of men who later will enjoy every opportunity of controlling the destinies of their several countries, the class of the citizen soldiers returned from the prolonged vigil and abomination of trench warfare. No one can do more than guess what the state of mind of these soldiers will be. My correspondent's guess is peculiarly interesting both because he has talked with many British soldiers on leave from the front and because of the nature of his observations and inferences. He attributes to the citizen soldier an attitude toward war and peace sharply contrasted with the attitudes of those who are now most vociferously articulate back of the line; and if this attitude exists to the extent which he believes, and continues to exist after the war, it is bound to have a formative influence on the future politics of the British Commonwealth. Let us see how the soldier's state of mind looks to a close but detached observer:

It is unfortunately inevitable that at this time the war should be interpreted and the ideals of peace prepared by men who have stayed at home—that is to say, in the vast majority of cases, by those who have suffered and sacrificed least. It is the plain duty of us "thinking men" and "writing men" thus to interpret and prepare, but we should do well to realize how easily our work may, through lack of understanding or imagination, become a betrayal of our brothers.

England is perhaps the best country to study for the divergence between opinion at home and at the front. No Englishman with eyes to see can have failed to experience the pathetic misunderstanding between the trenches of France and the writing desks of London. Let a wounded officer or enlisted man meet a thinker of his own country, who is sure of himself and his opinions, whether that thinker be pacifist or jingo, leader of labor or win-the-war Tory statesman, philosopher of democracy or clergyman of the Established Church. Let the thinker explain his highest hopes or his darkest fears for society, according to his temperament and training. Let him spread before the soldier—not the professional fighter of old days but the boy snatched from his first keen year at the University or from the deadening routine of the clerk's desk—all the high words that have been spoken about Democracy by statesmen, journalists or professors, or all the beneficent reforms and triumphs of reconstructive administration in the industrial world which have undeniably been in some sort the product of the war. Then you will see that, so far from impressing the soldier, these thoughts and this information reduce him to helpless despair.

He knows intimately what war is and feels therefore more keenly the inability of statesmanship to prevent it. As a member of that most rigidly governed community in the world, an army on active service, he has daily and hourly experience of the limitations of human authority and wisdom. His half humorous criticisms of the "brass hats" of the staff and the politicians at home are the signs of his surface discontent; but there is a deeper source of impatience of which he is scarcely aware himself. Fundamentally, he has been driven back upon the eternal problem of man's incapacity for righteousness to which the modern world had become deadened in the same manner and for the same reasons as the Jewish world became deadened to it centuries ago. He has vividly learnt again that formulated law is necessary and obedience to it a duty, but that every law so formulated falls short of the true standard and, to the extent of its shortcoming, creates a conflict of loyalty between the imperfect rule to which he can conform and the perfect commandment of his allegiance to which he is a perpetual confession of failure. He has recognized war as his duty, but he has never ceased to regard it with horror and, having made his choice with conviction, what he seeks is not an escape from the horns of a moral dilemma but a reconciliation of two moral certainties. He is less interested in Mr. Lloyd George's ministry of reconstruction than in St. Paul's ministry of reconciliation. He has no patience either with those who advocate "peace through negotiation" or with those who go forth to battle by proxy with "Democracy and no quarter" on their banners. He is quite willing to be interested in a League of Peace as a convenient expedient; but he will not recognize it as even beginning to satisfy his determination that this shall be "a war to end war." He certainly would not be content to construe Miss Cavell's last words in the light of it. To him, surely, "patriotism is not enough" means nothing less than "politics is not enough." As a matter of awful fact and experience, and not as a matter of political theory, it is very doubtful whether a man dies more cheerfully for a world state, for a league of nations, than for his home. Something there is, indeed, in his heart for which he will sacrifice more than for his country, but modern psychology has not yet found a new name or a new "moral equivalent" for that secret treasure. It remains true that, even in a world war for an enduring peace, men, even Germans in theory, demand the exemption of women and children from physical suffering, while no persecuted sect has ever claimed their exemption from martyrdom.

We have heard much, and very truly, of the "failure" of the church in this war, but is the failure on the whole so great as that of the political thinker? The Pharisee and the Herodian are in the same boat with the scribe in this matter, but no one can have failed to observe that here and there at the front and even at home, the "padre" has lately been winning on the editor and the orator by virtue simply of a willingness to confess that, while he knows surely from what direction the solution will come, he yet, to his shame, neither knows exactly what it is nor is able to offer it to those who seek it. Assuredly, unless those who put their faith in democracy and internationalism can achieve a like humility, the eventual decision of the peace conference will be sadly misrepresentative of the best minds and hearts in the belligerent countries.

And here we have to face a very real danger. "Democ-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

racy," to those who have authoritatively pronounced it to be the aim and sanction of this war, surely means a painstaking effort to adapt all the members of our national communities, little by little, and step by step, to the changes and chances of modern life; having in view the end conceived by Greece, of a "good life" shared unbrokenly by every individual member of a common human society. But this same "democracy" is now being trumpeted in our ears by a thousand preachers as a gospel of human mastery, claiming the absolute allegiance of thinkers, and therefore of those whom they teach, to the exclusion of every other faith and every other hope. It is the preaching of an orthodoxy professedly rooted in scientific certainty, whose impact upon the human mind bids fair to create an active intolerance more ruthless and loveless than that which any hierarchy has yet conceived.

Now it is against this class of conception in general as much as against that particular form of it which we call Prussianism that our brothers and sons are fighting in the trenches today. This is their developing faith—to this they are winning through their struggle with a living horror which to us has become skeletoned into certain half-mistaken formulas about "militarism." We will have no government that claims impeccability, no governmental principles that seek to impose themselves as principles of life and thought. We know that these things are evil. We know that they make for war. We believe that the effects of such beliefs on national education were more potent factors in this war than any "international anarchy" and for preventing future wars we look not so much to expedients of internationalism as to a fundamental revision of national education and of those catchwords of competitive internal government and pseudo-scientific teaching in which modern nations have latterly put their trust.

Of course you will not be able to find a soldier who will say anything of all this to you. You will find him inarticulate, usually silent, sometimes vaguely explosive. But this is not far from what he is beginning to feel. We cannot any longer dismiss him as a mere soldier, for the citizen army to which he belongs is the best and most normal blood of the country. It becomes us rather to say in the words of Ruskin, spoken many years ago: "Gentlemen, I tell you solemnly that the day is coming when the soldiers of England must be her tutors, and the captains of her army captains also of her mind."

London, England.

The foregoing account of the returning soldier's mind may or may not be true. If a cynic prefers to prophesy that collectively they are more likely to behave like a Grand Army of the Republic than with a Franciscan mixture of humility and faith, there is no way of proving him wrong. But although the account is necessarily largely a matter of interpretation, it is worth while to accept it provisionally as true and to consider what the meaning and consequences of its truth may be. The interpretation even though it happen to be false might well be true, provided only the citizen militant permits his attitude toward war and peace to reflect the realities of his own situation and experience. The men whose experience in this war promises to be of most value to their fellows are not those who are fighting jubilantly or thoughtlessly or with absolutely righteous self-satisfaction. They are not those who from motives which they consider lofty have shirked the common burden and have refused from conscientious scruples to fight at all. Least of all are they men who because of age or some other physical disability have been unable to fight. They are the citizens who have recognized a binding obligation to throw themselves into a war which began with a clear violation of right by one of the combatants and upon the issue of which depended the future fulfillment of so many human lives, but who have never ceased to regard the performance of that obligation with abhorrence. It is these last who, if they are robust enough in mind and conscience to live through this conflict of moral certainties without losing faith and without capitulating to any quick and easy escape, would have qualified to pass from being captains of their country's armies to captains of their country's mind.

My correspondent does not attempt to anticipate how this conflict of moral certainties in the souls of the citizens militant will work out, nor what positively they will do with the mind of England, when they enter into their captaincy. Of one character and of one only is he wholly convinced. The citizen militant, as the result of the conflict, will be relieved of any pride of his own wisdom or that of others. He will distrust human government, foresight and presumption, and this distrust will have one salient and salutary expression. He will have no confidence in the proposals, above all the political proposals, with which the stay-at-home politicians and publicists seek to mitigate or annul the rigors of his problem. For him politics and statesmanship are powerless to put an end to war and powerless, consequently, to foreshadow the reconciliation of his moral antinomy. If wars are to be prevented, the agency of prevention will not be leagues of peace and political democracy, but a chastening of the human spirit, a profound conviction of the inability of government, even when infused with good will and enlightened by science, to heal the spiritual distempers of mankind. The one perfect expression of the deepest moral experience of the war should be a humility of mind of which the prevailing propaganda of democracy and internationalism form a conspicuous defiance.

I hope the interpretation of my correspondent is true and I would be the last to deny that, if it be true, the future captains of the nation's mind would show some impatience with the presumptuous claims now being made on behalf of internationalism and democracy. The conflict in the soul of the citizen soldier between his clear obligation to fight and his abhorrence of war is a moral tragedy, of which the only fitting immediate expression is humility of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mind: and no doubt such humility should bring with it among other things a disposition to distrust the efficacy of merely political remedies, which one rarely finds among international democratic propagandists. But surely in placing so much emphasis upon the withering effect which the "developing faith" of the citizen militant will have upon cocksure democratic formulas, my correspondent is allowing his irritation with the Philistinism of democracy to hinder him from tracing such stiff formularizing to its cause. In the second paragraph of his letter he classes jingoism with pacifism as the type of thinking which fills the returning soldier with helpless despair, but later when he comes to talk of "gospels of human mastery" which breed a ruthless and loveless intolerance he separates the jingo from the pacifist and confines his rebuke to the latter. In my opinion this separation falsifies his attitude toward the excessive claims of internationalism and democracy and prevents him from drawing the truer inference from the possible future possession by the citizen soldiers of a Franciscan humility of mind.

The exaggerated value which internationalist democrats attach to political remedies must surely be traced to the exigencies of their situation as propagandists and as controversialists. They are engaged in seeking a remedy for an admitted social evil, which in many of its manifestations is chiefly political and which, at least in part, can be reached by political remedies. The opposition to these remedies, which comes both from people who believe in war as a necessary agency of moral discipline and political change and from people whose exclusive preoccupation with their domestic policies and business interferes with their sense of international responsibility, is powerful and stubborn. Between them these two classes pretty much control the government of the world, and their "gospel of mastery" is not only quite as intolerant as that of the democrats but does not hesitate to secure its domination by the exercise of moral and physical force. No doubt in fighting such an enemy international democrats claim more for political remedies than such remedies alone can ever accomplish and assert their claims with active intolerance; but if they expect too much from politics, my correspondent seems unnecessarily fearful of the results of their exaggeration. They are only propagandists. It is less dangerous to overestimate the ability of international institutions which do not exist to prevent war than to ignore or underestimate the ability of war and preparation for war which are firmly established national institutions to pervert political values. The trying out of the proposed political remedies and the agitation associated therewith is necessary as an indication of good faith. Until they are tested we cannot be sure how much they will accomplish, and we cannot test them without seeking to destroy the prestige of those interests, so powerful in every large state, which believe in war as a desirable political instrument and moral discipline.

Internationalist democrats when they show a presumptuous confidence in political remedies and, consequently, in the creative power of human contrivance, are allowing themselves to be infected by the arrogance of their opponents. It is existing states and governments, no matter whether they are more or less democratic, which encourage presumption and intolerance by claiming impeccability. The legal and moral sovereignty on which they insist is, if it is followed through, bound to result in the imposition, so feared by my correspondent, of "governmental principles" as "principles of life and thought"; and the spokesmen and agents of state sovereignty at the present time are so fully convinced of the righteousness of these state decrees that they are only too ready to coerce troublesome protestants. These things, as my correspondent says, are evil. They express the state of mind which makes for war. Their effect on the national education was a "more potent factor" in this war than international anarchy, because international anarchy is the inevitable result of the existence of states which put forth such presumptuous claims and which educate officials and subjects as willing servants of their presumption. If the citizen militant does return from the trenches fully determined to introduce humility into politics and to do away with governments and governmental principles which claim impeccability and breed intolerance, he will begin not with the still remote and shadowy international government of a possible future, but with those existing embodiments and sources of "active intolerance," the governments as they exist today in all neutral and belligerent countries.

No matter how sincerely and justifiably the militant citizen may now be filled with "helpless despair" by the formulas of internationalist democracy, he will if he seeks to do away with political presumption, adopt as the most promising expedient, at least a part of the internationalist democratic program. The effect of that program, in so far as it works, will be to moderate the sovereign arrogance of existing states by increasing the penalties of national wilfulness and the rewards of successful international accommodations. But the value of these international institutions, even if they are successful, will not consist in any absolute assurance of the prevention of war. If they did provide such an assurance, they might well bring with them, as my correspondent fears, a cheerless, offensive and domineering world stateism. Their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

value will be measured by their ability to liberate within existing states voluntary economic, professional, technical propagandist and religious associations, which could be allowed a larger measure of autonomy, a more explicit license to compete with the state, than would be safe under a condition of international anarchy. The increase in the number and power of such free associations, the increasing recognition of their independence in the legal system, the increasing delegation to them under properly safeguarded limitations, of public administrative functions—all such measures of "reconstruction" would constitute the convincing possible testimony to the truth of the principle that at its best politics was not enough. It would be equivalent to the liberation of other faiths and hopes, to which my correspondent attaches so much importance. The state, by renouncing its absurd claims to impeccability and omnipotence in its relations with its own people, would be the more likely to eschew offensive arrogance in its transactions with other states. It would be more likely to provide an hospitable mansion for the accommodation of those who are lively, humble, patient and faithful in spirit.

My correspondent proposes as the most promising means of preventing future wars a fundamental revision of national education. By all means let us revise national education, but does not educational reform suffer as a remedy for war from a drawback analogous to that of political institutions? How far can it overcome that incapacity for righteousness on the part of human beings which is always baffling the reformer, and which is always calling for ministries of reconciliation rather than ministries of reconstruction. How can the state, whose necessarily imperfect rules fall so far short of the supreme commandment and whose political programs are either indifferent expedients or dangerous counsels of impeccability; how can statesmanship born of such a state devise an educational system which is more than a matter of secular information and less than a propaganda of state dogmatism and righteousness? German statesmen organized a system of national education which was supposed to make for moral character and social amelioration but which actually facilitated rather than prevented war, and any state whose spokesmen are profoundly convinced of its moral sovereignty will, when it proposes to organize a national system of moral or social education, seek as did the Germans primarily to cultivate loyalty to the state and intolerance of any competing interest or faith or hope. May we not, consequently, be obliged to seek a better system of national education by improvement in statesmanship rather than to seek a humbler and more tolerant statesmanship by means of a better system of national education?

As a matter of fact, the two processes are supplementary and go hand in hand. The political expedients which my correspondent contrasts with a revision of the national education system are as a matter of fact part of it. Their value consists not in any pretence of overweening accomplishment, not in any justifiable expectation of overcoming by international documents man's incapacity for righteousness, but in their quality of being honest and pertinent experiments. The civilized world, as it will be left by the war, will need to try an experiment of international organization just as it will need to try experiments in social readjustment. These experiments will work well or ill. If they work ill, they will be modified quickly. If they work well they will be modified more slowly and may bring with them new and unexpected evils, which in their turn will have to be exposed and overcome. But in any event their value is chiefly educational, and these educational fruits will be gathered more completely and quickly by the nations who can combine stability of purpose with inquisitive openness of mind. Our existing states have never dared to organize schools which sought to develop such a mixture of irreverence, humility and faith. It has never dared to remove the curse from disloyalty, because it was afraid of the effects of the resulting flexibility and inquisitiveness on its own attempt to be at one and the same time an anointed King and an impossible Pretender, but perhaps under the influence of this new captaincy of our mind it will reform. If only it will afford legal recognition to those foreign and domestic competitors which challenge and seek, not to displace but to share its sovereignty, the way will be cleared for a system of national education, which, if it cannot alleviate man's incapacity for righteousness, can at least make less intolerable some of its effects.

HERBERT CROLY.

A Fear

The yellow bird is singing by the pond,
And all about him stars have burst in bloom,
A colonnade lurks pallidly beyond,
And under that a solitary tomb.
Who lies within that tomb I do not know;
The yellow bird intones his threnody
In notes as colorless as clouded snow,
Clashing with the green hush, and out of key.

O cease! your frenzied song is out of tune
Where all these strange forgotten things are sleeping,
Give back to silence's eternal keeping
The stagnant pool, the hanging colonnade,
Lest in the wane of the long afternoon,
The dead awake, unhappy and afraid.

ROBERT SILLIMAN HILLYER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prudence and the Classics

MY friend Prudence has written me a letter about the study of the classics, which may be of interest to other parents. And some one better informed than I may be able to answer her questions.

You know better than anyone how much thought Henry and I gave to the children's education, and how anxious I am to carry out his ideas faithfully, not only because they were his ideas but because they are mine too. But never mind how hard you try not to notice it, things do change, and even when people use the same words as they always did, they seem somehow to have different meanings. Now you wouldn't think anything could be simpler than the question whether a child—I mean a boy, of course—should have a classical education or not. Henry always said, if you want your boy to be a gentleman, teach him Latin and Greek; if you don't, don't. And besides feeling that way about it, he was sure there was no discipline for the mind half as good as Latin grammar. Boys always hate it, so that's in its favor to begin with as a discipline. Henry began to study Latin when he was nine and Greek when he was twelve, and he kept them both going until his junior year, when he considered that his mind was formed. And certainly nobody had a finer mind than Henry,—every one who knew him admits that. I mean just *as* a mind. He didn't show it off by writing for the magazines or taking up public questions or any of that sort of self-advertising. He just simply had a splendid mind. But, as you see, Henry always knew he was to have enough money to live on without slaving, whereas my poor little Harry will only have a third as much, since by his father's will he and the girls are to share and share alike after I am gone. It is clear therefore that he will have to have a profession or go into business, so it would be silly to make his mind the first consideration. Henry foresaw this; and also that people who are going to employ young men are not so glad as they used to be to find one who has had a classical education. Among his many wise sayings I remember that he often used to declare, "Times have changed." Henry never feared to face the truth.

But we had not come to any decision about Harry when Henry went, and left me to face all these things alone. Harry was only six then, and the need for a decision seemed a long way off, but now it must be made at once—indeed I fear I have already put it off longer than I should. When I first began to think about it seriously I tried to read all the arguments I came across, for or against the classics, but mostly for, of course, since this is the direction in which I want to be convinced. I saw a notice of a book called How to Save Greek at Oxford, and I sent for it at once, because it is just that Oxford flavor about Greek that I adore. Well, that book gave me my first real shock. It is by a man named Snow—I never heard of him before or since—and, my dear, he is a socialist. I read it again and again, feeling as if I were through the looking-glass; that is the only place, I should have supposed, where Oxford dons can be socialists. There is no doubt about it; and he says a classical education has been in England a monopoly of the snobbish rich, but that now, when they are attacking it in the name of efficiency, "is the time for socialists to take it up." He says the Greeks with all their cultivation were very poor people, and so, by studying their ways, poor people today can see that you don't need to be rich to be refined. I confess this was very upsetting to me. Of course one knows from sculpture and Isadora Duncan and all that sort of thing that the Greeks dressed very inexpensively, but it never occurred to me that it was from motives of economy. Well, the point is that this Oxford man seems to think the classics are not what they were socially, and that they are useful to socialists. That sounds odd because the words are so much alike, but you know what I mean. This point of view disturbed me a good deal, but even if it is like that in England, I couldn't believe things had gone so far with us.

Last summer another Englishman gave me my second shock. It was William Archer in his God and Mr. Wells. Of course I have been puzzled, as most thoughtful Christians have been, by Mr. Wells' religious ideas. It is nice to have anyone so clever as Mr. Wells standing up for God, but it does seem strange if it has been reserved for him to find the real truth about Him. Mr. Archer is furious with him for even talking about such a thing, being himself, apparently, little better than an atheist. But of course one is used to finding that all about us. What gave me a turn, because it bore so directly on my choice of a school for Harry, was this passage:

"It has sometimes seemed to me that the one great advantage of western Christianity lies in the fact that nobody very seriously believes in it. Nobody is not a mathematically accurate expression, but it is quite in the line of the truth. . . . You have to go to Asia to find out what religion means.

"I cannot believe that anywhere between Suez and Singapore, there exists that healthy godlessness . . . which is so common in and around all Christian churches. The difference does not arise from any lesser stringency in the claims of Christianity to a spiritual dominion, but rather, I

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imagine, from a deep-seated divergence in racial heredity. We western Aryans have behind us the serene and splendid rationalisms of Greece and Rome. We are accustomed from childhood to the knowledge that our civilization was founded by two mighty aristocracies of intellect, to whom the religions of their day were, as they are to us, nothing but more or less graceful fairy-tales. We know that many of the greatest men the world ever saw, while phrasing their relation to the *deus absconditus* in various ways, were utterly free from that penitential, supplicatory abjectness which is the mark of Asian salvationism."

This is really almost incredible to me. Henry's classical education never had the slightest effect on his spiritual life. He was a vestryman to the day of his death, and never had any patience with irreligious talk. Of course every one knows the heathen gods were fairy-tales; what has that to do with true religion? But if the classics are taught in some different way today so that this kind of thing can be twisted out of them, then the attack on them is not half bitter enough.

The last straw was laid on my pile of misgivings when I read an article in The New Republic about this wretched academic freedom. The whole discussion is most distasteful, and I know how painful it would have been to Henry. Several of the Columbia trustees were among his friends, as you know, and he would have applauded their fearless discharge of their duty. The writer of this article was down on them, however, and he seemed to think he had proved the right of a college professor to say anything that comes into his head, by quoting Plato's remark that we must "follow the argument whithersoever it may lead." Now, my dear, I ask you! Is my boy to be filled up with such stuff as that? Henry used to say, "the difference between a man and a machine is that a man knows where to draw the line." Apparently Plato—who always seemed safe if anybody was—(Platonic love and all that—of course it doesn't really work but the idea is lovely) simply drew no lines at all, and that seems to me the end of everything. I was rather intrigued by what the writer of the article hinted about Plato's views of women, and I got a classical friend to mark the passage for me to read. Of course you know all about it. All I can say is I could hardly believe it wasn't a practical joke—that my friend hadn't sent me a book by one of those queer young men from Greenwich Village, bound up with Plato's name on it. He certainly doesn't draw the line where decent people do.

I was a good deal reassured by reading Mr. Howland's article on education awhile ago. He is just as much afraid of the classics as I am, but on such different grounds that his fears are my hopes. He thinks that if children get to reading things that were said a long time ago, they will not be ready to change all their ideas at a moment's notice. If I could really believe that, Harry should study Latin and Greek without further fuss. But when I find an agnostic maintaining that irreligion thrives because "we are accustomed from childhood to the knowledge of the splendid rationalisms of Greece and Rome," why, then I say let us stop knowing about them from childhood. And if socialism and feminism and academic freedom base their arguments on Plato, let us cut out Plato. I can't see that his having lived so long ago makes him so innocuous as Mr. Howland thinks.

As I recall Henry's description of his own classical studies, I feel sure the whole system has changed. Henry studied chiefly Latin grammar through all those years. He used to say that after seven years of it he couldn't understand a Latin sentence without a translation, and often not with one. Of course in this way he got simply the good of the study without the contamination of the ideas. Then again, he studied Latin longest and most, whereas it is from the Greeks apparently that all the dangerous notions come. It seems almost as though Rome were a kind of a Typhoid Mary—she nourished the Greek germs and dispersed them all over the world, but she never really had the disease herself.

I am boring you with all my ideas at this length because I want your advice on a practical question. When I had become thoroughly scared about the classics, or at any rate about Greek, as a bad influence, I began to think seriously of sending Harry to this new school Mr. Flexner has started. (Of course the girls' education, thank heaven, is plain sailing; I want them simply to be happy wives and mothers, and that's easy. They're both very pretty.) I understood that this school was to be pleasant for the children and to teach them only the things that are really useful, and, above all, that it would omit Latin and Greek. But I noted in the announcement in the papers that "efforts will be made to see whether the important ancient classics cannot be effectively used in translations." This, I am afraid, gives the whole thing away. If they really do make this effort, and if it is successful, our children will be exposed to the full force of those splendid rationalisms that didn't draw any lines, without having any grammar study to keep them from seeing what is really meant. My practical question, then, is this: do you really think they are going to try to make effective use of translations of the ancients in the modern school?

EMILY JAMES PUTNAM.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Women in War Industries

WE have been at war seven months without collecting any definite data on the women engaged in war industries. At present neither the Bureau of Registration of the Department of Labor, nor the Bureau of Labor Statistics, nor the various governmental advisory committees on women in industry can furnish accurate information on the demand and supply of women workers in the trades furnishing war materials. From scattered bits of unofficial information, it is possible, however, to get an outline of the situation, and to be certain that women, both married and unmarried, are now being recruited into industry in large numbers. Furthermore, we have already begun to repeat Europe's wasteful and cruel industrial blunders. To avoid widespread lowering of labor standards, immediate protective measures for our women workers are needed, but as yet the government has failed to formulate any adequate, effective program of action.

Already women organized for war relief have conducted campaigns urging other women to enter canneries, munition plants and clothing factories as a patriotic duty. Training schools have started to fit women as conductors, telegraphers and wireless operators. Our newspapers are filled with pictures of overalled young ladies, anxious to "do their bit" in any and every capacity.

The steadily growing demand for women workers, caused by the rush to supply war materials, has been felt in the usual women trades, such as the garment and textile industries. The Department of Labor finds government contracts held up because of a shortage of women machine operators. Appeals have been sent out by the Federal Government, such as: "There is urgent need for 1,000 women to sew on sailor uniforms for ten hours a day at the Charleston Navy Yard. All women who are free to leave their homes during the day are urged to offer their services."

Philadelphia and Baltimore manufacturers in the garment and textile trades have appealed to women's war relief organizations as well as the Federal Employment Service for Workers. The Navy Yard has stated that thousands more women will be needed to make clothing supplies by next spring.

Women have not begun to enter essentially masculine occupations on any large scale, yet there is a marked tendency for them to do so. The Labor Department's Bureau of Registration finds no difficulty in getting women applicants for work in the metal trades, machine shops and on the railroads. Women are said to be attracted by the higher wages paid in men's trades, or by the desire to extend their sphere and prove their patriotism. A number of new industrial fields are being opened to them. Six important railroad companies have stated their decision to substitute women in many positions. Last August, one road employed over a thousand women, working as engine wipers, car washers, oilers, coach cleaners and machinists. A few have served as guards for railroad crossings and as "tower women" to direct trains. Longshore work, such as the operation of electric trucks and the unpacking of crates, has been performed by women on New York docks. Calls for women workers have been issued by many of the steel manufacturing plants. In the Chicago stock-yards, one company uses seven thousand women, which is about three times the number employed a year ago. An aeroplane manufacturer has just added over a thousand women to his wing-making department.

In the munition industry, women workers were in demand as early as 1915. In the rush to meet European war orders, the large plants of Delaware, Pennsylvania and Connecticut sought to recruit women unaccustomed to factory work, married women and girls from other trades. In 1916, the Remington Arms Union Metallic Cartridge Company alone had four thousand women workers. With the present need to supply our own nation with war materials, the number of women munition makers is bound to increase. The War Department has called on the Department of Labor to furnish large numbers of women "skilled in munitions." Private manufacturers have called on women's war service employment bureaus for such workers.

The war has not only stimulated the employment of women in general but it has forced into industry an unusually large number of married women. The Federal Children's Bureau recently sent agents to the Chicago stock-yards who reported a notable addition of married women workers. The Bureau finds a similar increase in other parts of the country. Several companies, such as the Loose-Wiles Biscuit and the American Express, have stated their desire to give employment to the wives of drafted men so that the job might "stay in the family." The manager of a large department store in Kansas recently reported that many married women whose husbands are in army service are seeking work and that he finds they "make better clerks" than the unmarried girls. Social workers in Bridgeport found that married women worked in factories on night shifts to help meet increased expenses.

The present need for protection of women in industry is not merely a matter of welfare work—a means of lightening women's heavy war burdens;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nor is it only a precaution against the exhaustion of an important factor in our labor supply. It is a necessity for the conservation of our nation's human resources. If we allow labor standards to be lowered, we cannot plead innocent on the ground of patriotic fervor or pressure for increased output. We have the experience of England and France from which to learn. At the beginning of the war these countries suspended their labor regulations. Workers were exhorted patriotically to forget self-interest because of the dire need for supplies. The endurance of the industrial army was overtaxed. But in the middle of the war this policy of blind haste was rejected and an attempt made at scientific adjustment. The Health of Munition Workers Committee, appointed by the British Government in 1915, reported that to obtain efficient and intense production healthful standards were essential. Moderate hours, measures for the decrease of industrial fatigue, provision for both prevention and treatment of work accidents and industrial disease; improvement of housing and transit facilities; canteens supplying hot food and special welfare work for women were some of the recommendations of the Committee. As a consequence of such investigations both France and England have restored nearly all their pre-war standards; and new protective measures for women, such as a minimum wage law for home workers and prohibitions of extra heavy work, were adopted. The decrease in the birth rates and the fear of an increase in infant mortality led European states to do much to protect maternity. Additional health visitors, increased mother's pensions, free medical service, special regulations for the work of pregnant women are some of the measures taken during the war.

If our more hard-pressed Allies have found it imperative to safeguard their women in order to have steady workers and healthy mothers, surely this country might be expected to profit by their example. Yet at the very outbreak of war, a movement was begun to lower labor standards. Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut and Minnesota passed laws giving the governor power to suspend labor regulations. The New York legislature passed such a bill but it was vetoed by the governor. At the same time, however, the forces to uphold standards mobilized for action. The American Association for Labor Legislation, the Consumers' League, the Women's Trade Union League and the American Federation of Labor made a stand against labor law exemptions. Their activity was not without effect. President Wilson, Secretary Baker and Secretary Daniels expressed their desire to maintain standards. The Council of National Defense took a similar attitude.

Fortunately, the pressure to degrade working conditions has been temporarily resisted, but the mere maintenance of existing standards will not protect women in industry. In many occupations, standards are low or do not exist. In the garment trade, for instance, there are many unskilled workers who are unorganized and therefore powerless to uphold regulations. Contracting out of materials to be sewed by home workers is usually attended by sweat shop conditions. Night work and overtime were found to be prevalent in the munition plants at Bridgeport in 1916 by an investigator for the Russell Sage Foundation. Lack of adequate accident preventive measures and women working in constant fear of explosion were also reported. No compensation was given for industrial disease. We know that such compensation is needed from Dr. Alice Hamilton's study of industrial poisoning in munition plants made for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Dr. Hamilton found women workers exposed to poisoning from fulminate of mercury which causes skin eruptions, and also to TNT of trinitrotoluol which results in toxic jaundice. Women engaged in masculine occupations like railroad work need regulations prohibiting overstrain, such as lifting heavy weights. These are some of the conditions that "existing standards" do not meet. Nor do they cover such suffering as is caused by the congested housing, lack of proper transportation, high rents and high prices in an industrial boom town.

Various unrelated efforts to save women from war time industrial oppression are being made by women themselves. Thus, Representative Rankin has been protesting against a twelve hour day for women government employees. Mrs. Florence Kelly has started to investigate uniform making. Julia Lathrop of the Federal Children's Bureau, together with others interested in the subject, influenced the Council of National Defense to pass resolutions favoring the provision of mother's pensions. Women trade unionists, suffragists and social workers have been agitating for equal pay for equal work regardless of sex.

The most important work along these lines is being carried on by the women members of the two committees on women in industry of the Council of National Defense.

By a nation wide registration of women, the Women's Committee of the Council of National Defense hopes to get facts on the number of skilled and unskilled, employed and unemployed women workers. Their sub-committee on women in industry is undertaking a study of labor conditions in various firms to discover whether proper standards are enforced. Investigators have been sent to the canning camps of New York state and Mary-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land. Such members of the committee as Miss Agnes Nestor, Vice-President of the International Glove-Makers' Union, and Mrs. Raymond Robbins, President of the Women's Trade Union League, are in actual touch with women wage earners and therefore in a good position to understand industrial conditions. Working with the New York branch of the organization are such well known investigators as Josephine Goldmark and Marie Van Kleek. The Committee has made a definite stand for the maintenance of existing standards; the prohibition of nightwork and extra heavy or extra hazardous jobs for women and equal pay for equal work. Their program includes the teaching of English to foreign born women workers and the placing of colored woman labor that has moved to the north.

The Committee on Women in Industry of the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense, of which Mrs. J. Borden Harriman is the head, is likewise engaged in a study of the war's effect on women workers. Agents have been sent to the garment trade centers of Brooklyn and Philadelphia. Their sub-committee on foreign born labor has sent out bulletins to the foreign press which urge the women to refuse to work on night shifts and collectively to demand relaxation periods. A similar demand for high standards is made by this committee.

The committees on women in industry are working along the right lines but their action is hampered in two respects. Because their function is advisory to the government, they cannot openly seek public support. Thus, neither committee can openly denounce night work for women in the Charleston Navy Yard, though both are opposed to night work. Miss Agnes Nestor's committee could not state its program of action because it had not yet been approved by Secretary Baker. Mrs. J. Borden Harriman's committee could not state its resolutions until they had been passed by Mr. Gompers's Advisory Committee on Labor. These committees can merely recommend standards to the government, who may or may not take their advice. They are also hampered by a lack of coöperation among themselves. While there is agreement as to the desired program, orthodox trade unionists wish action to come chiefly from the organized workers, while social workers want government protection. The trade unionist dislikes paternalism and fears that the wage-earner will lose his independence, while the social worker does not cherish a "freedom" to overwork and starve.

Before any advance can be made, it is clearly necessary for the various factions advising the government on this subject to settle their differences as to methods and ends. They should draw up a definite, carefully worked out government policy. At present, not only has the government failed to formulate any program as to many much needed protective measures, but it is not enforcing its vague stand for "upholding existing standards." Thus, the eight hour day at the Charleston Navy Yard is used only as a basis for pay. Ten hour days and night shifts are in force. The Department of Labor has decided to refuse government contracts to home workers but nothing is done to enforce this ruling. If the advisory committees would agree on the necessary steps to be taken and if the various organizations in favor of the program would unite to win it public support, it would be a simple matter to put into operation. No state or federal legislation is required. The state departments need only issue orders as to labor regulations in all plants supplying government contracts.

Europe waited until the disastrous situation forced her to act. Those of us whose patriotism is sufficiently farsighted to desire the preservation of our human resources must insist that our government heed Europe's warning.

ESTHER NORTON.

The Russian Crisis

REVOLUTIONARY Russia has in unmistakable terms put up to the Allies now the question of Russia's future position in the war. Trotzky's seven days' ultimatum to the Allies to declare clearly and definitely their war aims in case of their refusal to participate in the proposed general armistice is really the logical sequence to Kerensky's seven months' efforts to achieve the same object through diplomacy. While Trotzky's present action signifies that the extremists have stopped to listen to the counsels of moderation, it is at the same time a warning that all the revolutionary elements of Russia are now backing the foreign policy of the Bolshevik government.

Therein lies the tremendous import of the suspension of the armistice scheme by the Bolsheviki. By this suspension the Lenine-Trotzky group intended to accomplish two ends. First, the consolidation of all the democratic forces behind its rule. Second, the ability to place the responsibility for their future actions on the Allies. The first is already a fact. As revolutionary Russia was united in the demands for an Allied restatement of war aims, Trotzky's ultimatum is practically the voice of all Russia. As to the second, the Allies cannot find a surer way of playing into the hands of Lenine and Trotzky than to ignore or reject their request for a restatement of war aims.

The game of the Bolsheviki is clear. They do

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not believe that the Allies will restate their war aims, but they adopted the present course in order to silence their opponents. Expecting to receive no response from the Allies, they are preparing to come to the Russian masses at the expiration of the seven days with such a message: "See, we have given the Allies an opportunity to repudiate their imperialistic aims, but they have not availed themselves of it because they really are imperialistic." This would enable the Bolsheviki to carry into effect their armistice proposal and follow the path leading to a separate peace.

If the Allies are not desirous of helping Lenine and Trotzky drive Russia into the arms of Germany, there is no other course for them to adopt than a quick and benevolent response to Trotzky's ultimatum. That would undermine the Bolsheviki and uphold the hands of the moderates. It would have the effect of stopping the civil war started by the Cossack generals, Kaledines and Korniloff. It would be a disaster indeed if the Allies were to be deceived by the mirage of a success by the Cossacks and lend them their moral support. Such an attitude would completely annihilate the last vestige of confidence still maintained in the Allies by various revolutionary elements, uniting the latter against their common foe, the Cossacks. The movement of the latter against the Bolshevik government is doomed. There can be no question as to that. Russia is not ripe yet for a successful counter-revolution. The people are not yet disillusioned of the revolution. They believe that they are now on the brink of attaining peace, and will not permit any interference with a government holding out this promise to them.

As a result of the Cossack revolt a reunion of the revolutionary parties is likely to follow. The Bolsheviki as the exclusive rulers of Russia may go.

But the government succeeding them will incorporate into its immediate program their ideas on the war, so that the foreign policy of revolutionary Russia cannot be expected to undergo radical changes as a result of the withdrawal of the Bolsheviki from the leadership of the nation.

There is a mistaken idea abroad that Kerensky's government was overthrown by the Bolsheviki. The latest available information totally disproves this assumption. Kerensky's government was not overthrown. It fell of its own accord, as a result of a long process of disintegration. What was the cause of this crumbling away of Kerensky's power? His failure to carry out the chief mandate of the revolution—the bringing about of peace. The Russian masses had made up their minds that the Allies were just as imperialistic as the Central Powers, which made it impossible for the Russian democracy to participate in a war foreign to its nature. They wanted their government to exert every ounce of its strength in the direction of peace. Kerensky's failure to obtain an Allied restatement of their war aims sealed his fate, as that implied Russia's continuing the war for the same purposes as Czarism had waged it. This led to a gradual withdrawal by the main elements of revolutionary Russia of their support of the Kerensky government.

On the evening of November 6th this process was completed. That evening Kerensky appeared in the Preliminary Parliament, which had been debating the foreign policy of the Provisional Government for several days, and asked for a vote of confidence. The Preliminary Parliament was Kerensky's own creation. It was to sustain him till the Constituent Assembly met. But even in his own last stronghold Kerensky failed to get support. The resolution of the Extreme Left, condemning the government's debility in the domain of foreign relations, was passed. That alone meant that the Provisional Government of Kerensky was legally dead.

Negotiations were immediately begun the same night for a coalition Socialist government. It was here that the Bolsheviki stepped in. Availing themselves of the state of mind of the masses, they usurped the prerogatives of the other Socialist parties and set up a factional government. The Bolsheviki are thus innocent of disrupting the Kerensky government. That was accomplished by the masses. The Bolsheviki are, however, guilty of usurping the legitimate coalition government in the process of formation on the night of November 6th-7th. That government, had it come into existence, would nevertheless have inaugurated a foreign policy for Russia only slightly different from the present. For the movement that brought the Bolsheviki into power was not a partisan affair, but a national and universal current. Today every powerful Socialist party in Russia is pledged formally to a government having peace as its first objective.

When the Constituent Assembly meets, the Lenine-Trotzky rule will automatically end, as that of Kerensky would have, had it lived another month. All Russian parties are agreed on the supreme authority of the Constituent Assembly. Now there is no doubt that the Bolsheviki will be in the minority in the assembly. However, the Socialist parties will be in the majority, and these are all pacifist. The government that the Constituent Assembly will set up is therefore sure to carry out the revolutionary mandate of exerting every influence for universal peace.

It cannot be emphasized too much that the Rus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sian crisis is not an internal affair. Were the new Russia at peace, she would unquestionably be confronted now by a series of grave domestic crises, such as have resulted from every great revolution.

What ails Russia today is not the effects of the revolution, but its cause. Fundamentally, the Russian revolution was directed against the Czar and the war in so far as it was Czar-made. The present new Russia is a war-baby, and she came into existence primarily for the purpose of eradicating the Czarist, imperialistic war. Free Russia is doomed if she fails to achieve this object. The day of her birth was also the date of the end of the Czaro-Allied union. Russia's revolution was an automatic repudiation of the Czar's imperialistic treaties with the Allies. If the latter wished to continue as colleagues of the new Russia, their first step should have been a repudiation of their shares of those treaties; their next step—to arrive at an understanding with revolutionary Russia, who is by no means averse to fighting for democracy. They failed to take both steps, thus forcing the Russian democracy to follow an impossible path, the very path against which it revolted.

ISAAC DON LEVINE.

CORRESPONDENCE

"The Price of a Home"

SIR: Julia Clark Hallam's articles on this topic have opened up a field of inquiry too long encrusted with traditionalism. The three homes I know best point the moral of her tale. They are my mother's, my cousin's and my best friend's. Mother paid the price: the other two refused to.

Mother has a modern home with most of the improvements. My father, of artistic temperament, clung desperately to an uncongenial business to provide it, and mother did her fifty-three per cent. She saved bread crumbs in the kitchen and bought two oriental rugs. She harried her maid servants, and scrubbed to show them how, and made me the prettiest clothes out of my aunt's old silk ones, for she was clever and always wanted us to look as if my father's income was five times larger than it was. Mother taught Sunday-school, ran the church sociables, and defended the minister against his detractors. Mother was always sure, she was never a slacker, and her slogan was always "do it for the home." If she was frequently ill and father had large bills to pay the doctors, it was because mother was so "devoted to the home." If she was a little extravagant occasionally, and bought pale blue rugs for a much used bath room, she did it "for the home." If she banished pretty dresses in the house and broke up social intercourse at that rare hour, the early evening, because the supper dishes must be washed, those nights when maids were out or wholly fled, she did it "for the home."

If from small girlhood I cried in bed at night wishing for a *real* mother, it was because mother was setting the sponge for her favorite raised brown bread. She heard our prayers of course. She never received our confidences. She raised five children much as she did the bread. One, the middle-aged eldest, lives with her today, with no more right to her own guests in her mother's big living room or at her mother's table than an alien. Why? Because mother is the creator, preserver and guardian of the home. It must be quiet, in order, and spotless, to be a home. She has tied on bibs, bathed her children and fed her family all these forty-five years, until tieing, cleaning, cooking are the ends of her life. She is fairly well physically, but her once alert mind is no more open to a new idea than a used and rusted tin can. At sixty-five, though she still goes to church, spiritual values have little weight. Comfort is her ideal. The food she eats, the chair she sits on, the way the window curtains hang are her topics of conversation. She has spent forty-five years trying to make herself and her family comfortable. Comfort is her achievement, not motherhood. And that is the price she has paid for her home. (Each member of the family also has paid, but that is another story.)

Many of my earliest ideals I received from mother's cousin, who had a home without housekeeping, like the lilies in the field. She and her student husband and her three splendid sons and her pretty adopted daughter (born of a Greek, a wayside peddler) all lived in a house, to be sure; it rambled on the outskirts of a village, and it had a library and a little organ. I can't remember anything else in it worth mentioning. Oh yes, there was a wonderful silk patchwork quilt which was placed on my bed when I visited there. I, merely a girl, to be treated like a lady! I had always been accustomed to comfort: but to be treated with respect! That was a new sensation. We ate bowls of rich, delicious cereals for dinner, and we conversed. That was another revelation. For a father and mother to sit at table and exchange opinions with three boys from eight to sixteen and neither hurry to business nor to housekeeping was no way to conduct a home, of course. But they didn't need to conduct it. Where they were, there *was* home. Their shelter was open always to the other cousin: their table, though plain, was always elastic. Cousin Ursula had a beautiful face and few pretty clothes. The boys had brains and little tailoring. In that town twenty years ago social settlements were unheard of. But the neighbors came to Cousin Ursula and Cousin Darwin for advice. He has gone: but today, at seventy, she is the wise and beloved friend of everybody. She was never enthusiastic about woman suffrage, because she said "there is much for a woman to do in her home"! All her boys voted for it because they grew up seeing that women may be as intelligent as men. Cousin Ursula reigned in her home; but she was not domestic. We were unconscious that she kept house, though food and clean clothes and hospitality never failed. She gave away her antique china plates and her mother's embroideries to her city cousins who doted on dusting and laundering. And when they grew fretful over paying the price they came back to her to recuperate and, looking out over green fields and a running brook, she told them the sweet, human stories of all her neighborhood. She would have charmed a drawing-room. She had discovered the universe in her village. But her relatives sniffed at her house-keeping.

My best friend's home is a city home with all the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

modern conveniences. It is backed by a solid income. Her mother earned the income. She went out into the world and left her two children daily. She tired of the monotony, the stifling never-get-anywhere of housekeeping. She was ill from mental numbness. She herself was so just, so upright, so big-minded there was little need of teaching these things to her children: they had passed their seventh year, molded in the strength of her own character, and are now two of our leading citizens.

This frail little woman regained her health, worked up into a highly responsible office position, put her two children through college. Now she is nearly seventy and is living in the home she earned herself, as a beloved grandmother. She does her daily portion of the housework, helps with the Red Cross and suffrage campaigns. Her house is scrupulously kept though there is no resident maid. No dishes are washed at night: life is too short and friends too precious. There are constantly friends at table because it is a house with a purpose. A whole assembly district in the recent New York suffrage campaign had its headquarters there. From it the workers went back and forth, over nine thousand women's signatures were classified, and eleven thousand voters were circularized.

My best friend's mother is not domestic. She refused to pay the price. But the value of her home is above rubies.

As Mrs. Childe has stated in her reply to Mrs. Hallam, the terms "home-making" and "housekeeping" are confused. But that's the point! We endlessly tie bibs and cook gruel for little children when a trained nurse in a neighborhood nursery could do it better, because we fear being accused of undomesticity. Tradition claims that only the housekeeper makes a home. In the meantime housekeeping is wrecking homes. Under its strain women grow petty and small-minded. Witness the fact that men's business evolves, and women's is conducted as in feudal times. Did you ever go, day after day, into thousands of middle-class homes of the average American woman? The disorder, inefficiency, lack of taste and of training of the housewife is appalling. What is the explanation?

A Lightseeking Housekeeper.

Rochester, N. Y.

"Would the South Let Them?"

SIR: In reply to a letter published in The New Republic of December 1st, from Joseph Cady Allen of Boston, in reference to giving votes to women by Federal Amendment, entitled "Would the South Let Them?" permit me to say that the contention of your correspondent seems to be based on an erroneous understanding of conditions.

There is a strong and growing sentiment in the South in favor of enfranchisement of women by Federal Amendment. I do not think your correspondent is accurate in describing that section as an "unwilling South" which would promptly proceed to "nullify the new Amendment as it has nullified the former ones," (the Fourteenth and Fifteenth) nor in presenting the alternative of nullification or a "force bill" as a necessary consequence of Federal enfranchisement.

The educational qualifications prescribed in some southern states are recognized by the North as just and necessary in safeguarding the administration of government against ignorance, and they are fully warranted by the state which offers free public instruction to all its citizens. They cannot rightly be regarded as nullification of the franchise; and recognition of this fact constitutes what your correspondent terms the "tacit consent" of the North. Southern women are prepared to sustain these provisions.

Nor would a "force bill" be necessary in communities where more than half of the members—the woman half plus some fair-minded and forward-looking men—recognize the justice of woman's claim to political freedom, and the desirability and directness of an immediate submission of a Federal Amendment to the legislatures of the several states in order that the women of the United States may become the political equals of those of Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the Scandinavian countries.

This great war for democracy is fusing the sentiment of the people: unity of action and concentration of effort are acknowledged necessities.

Elizabeth Langhorne Lewis.

Lynchburg, Virginia.

The Soul of an Anti

SIR: Mrs. Annie Nathan Meyer's letter, in The New Republic, might have borne, appropriately, the caption, The Soul of an Anti. Its revelation of the psychological mechanism of that curious anachronism, the anti-suffragist, is none the less lucid for being unconscious. Her earnest effort to make her determination to vote square with her professed abhorrence to the electoral enfranchisement of women, gives away the whole case of the anti-suffragists.

Of course they are going to vote! To suppose that they are not, would be to insult their intelligence. These women are too much in the thick of things to underestimate the importance of the ballot in a representative government and the political advantages of the voter over the non-voter. As sensible women they cannot blink the fact that their cause has been defeated and as sensible women they are going to share in the benefits resulting from their defeat. Their tendency to cast the glamor of martyrdom about their opportunism, is merely one of those lovable touches of nature which make the whole world kin. When Mrs. Meyer speaks of the "self-sacrifice" entailed in Mrs. Dodge's decision to vote, we cannot help remembering the estimable Pooh-Bah who accepted every pecuniary "insult" with a sepulchral: "What do you think of that, family pride?"

What then is the motivation of anti-suffragism? Do these eminent ladies believe that they, as individuals, are unfitted for political activity? Certainly not! I challenge any reader of The New Republic to attempt to prove to Mrs. Meyer that she is unable to cast her ballot intelligently. He will be met with a demonstration of her familiarity with political issues and with a recital of the long record of her achievements (to which she alludes in her letter, and which I, for one, have no desire to disparage). If the effect of the amendment recently passed had been to enfranchise—let us say—only the women whose names appear in the Social Register, the late opponents of the measure would have been its enthusiastic advocates.

And that is the secret of anti-suffragism. It is a thin disguise for Toryism. What the anti-suffragists fear is the extension of democracy. To them equality is fatuous sentimentality, freedom (for others) a dangerous experiment and socialization anathema. Like the late Mr. Baer they regard themselves—or their "class"—as the divinely constituted trustees for the million. Mrs. Meyer's utterances bristle with allusions to this class and that class, to socialists and pacifists and radicals and "liberals" (the inverted commas are hers). If the anti-suffragists dared,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they would advocate the imposition of limitations upon manhood suffrage. What they object to is not woman suffrage but suffrage for anybody who holds "certain views." To invoke Pooh-Bah again, they are "not in the habit of saying, 'How-de-do, how-de-do, little girls?' to anyone beneath the rank of a stockbroker." Mrs. Meyer accuses the suffragists of raising the sex issue. On the contrary, the suffragists are attempting to abolish the political distinction between the sexes. It is Mrs. Meyer and her coadjutors who are dragging the red herring of sex across the trail of their Bourbonism.

I agree with Mrs. Meyer that there are "few more pathetic figures than that of the anti-suffragist"—but to me the anti-suffragist is a pathetic figure, because she clings so desperately to moribund traditions, because she closes her eyes so resolutely to the spirit of her age and because she dissipates her talents in futile obstructionism instead of permitting them a flower in the un-aristocratic but fertile soil of our common humanity.

ELMER L. REIZENSTEIN.

New York City.

Dull Must She Be Who Finds Her House-Work Dull

SIR: I wish to protest vigorously against the whole conception of life implied in the article The Price of a Home. The writer appears to be horrified by the fact that three meals a day repeat themselves day after day, that dishes do not wash themselves, that the brain is not constantly stimulated by sweeping kitchen floors, and that housework does not count toward college degrees. She suggests that if a girl realized the fearful effect of home making upon her mind, that it stupified her intelligence and cut her off from graduate credits, she would never marry.

What are we in the world for anyway? Of what earthly importance is any particular woman's mental development? Have we not some bigger place in the scheme of things than "to prepare the mind for its higher activities and attainments." What does that "higher" really mean? May it not be that the home maker's privilege is to pass on the great human traditions, whose value is not measured by credits in any institution of learning nor even by a feeling of intellectual activity on the part of the home maker.

Life is not large or small according to the circumstances that seem to determine it. It is large or small according to the nature of the human being who reacts to it. The woman who finds housework dull is dull herself. If a round of teas, a course or two at college, chairmanship on a committee, or the espousing of a cause, makes her feel bright, the effect is much that of champagne on a diner—the facts of the case are not altered.

Why does not some one write on The Price of a Home from the man's point of view? How much mental stimulus does the bootblack get from his job? Should the clerk be outraged because his years of computation on the price of silk by the fraction of a yard do not count towards a mathematical degree? How much stimulus does the stoker find to meditate on Shakespeare, or even on Laura Jean Libbey? Do you imagine that the plumber feels his brain expanding every day? Might not even the banker complain that there was some monotony in his job?

Have we a right to demand that we be always interested, always amused, always working under varied and stimulating conditions?

Any reformer with that thesis had better begin with the industrial world and leave the home maker for the last. Fortunately the instinct that makes home making the dearest occupation of woman is not dependent upon any such delicate balancing of mental freshness and college degrees against the stupefying experience of wifehood and motherhood.

CORNELIA JAMES CANNON.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

What Is a Guaranty?

SIR: We have all known the speaker who can say nothing throughout a well rounded speech by running through the small change of oratory.

Let the first phrase that comes into his head be Old Glory, and he may think of something else while his speech runs smoothly on through the "blue and the gray," "Maine to California," "of the people, by the people," etc.

This sort of eloquence is usually adequate to the occasion, but not always. It is unsatisfactory to the earnest listener who comes to learn, and it is against this orator when he takes pen in hand that we would complain. We are told by him amongst other things that in the coming peace the "German people must furnish guaranties," "They must democratize their government," "Militarism must be crushed."

Now just what are these things *really?* Just what is it one does to "crush militarism"? Is it done by passing resolutions or by massacring every soldier above a corporal: and is it possible to make an undemocratic people democratic by force? How does one bring political freedom to a people who shout "you're a liar," whenever they are assured we believe them better than their Junkers?

A race who condones all the crimes of their rulers certainly has a representative government already. Believing in Prussianism, can we make them change their minds by punching their heads? And just what sort of a looking thing is a "guaranty"? Perhaps the Germans, who are to be called upon "to furnish" them know. We hope so. No one ever explains, and one is naturally abashed at feeling he is the only one ignorant.

Perhaps the Germans themselves do not know, but hardly wish to show their interest by asking.

ALLEN W. JACKSON.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

We Didn't Invent It

SIR: In your issue of November 24th, F. H. makes the statement that "American soldiers invented the fiendish water-cure." His attention is called to the following quotation from Evelyn's Diary, under date of March 11th, 1651:

"In this agonie, confessing nothing, the Executioner with a horne (such as they drench horses with) stuck the end of it into his mouth, and poured the quantity of two bouketts of water downe his throat and over him, which so prodigiously swelled him, as would have pittied and affrighted any one to see it."

This scene took place in a Paris prison.

The only improvement on this ancient method of water cure is the forcible expulsion of the water once the victim is full so that he may be again filled. And this was invented by the Spaniards and only appropriated by the American soldiers in some cases.

JOHN KNOX ARNOLD.

Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the Capitol

"That Responsibility May be Centered"

ONE of the five recommendations that the President thought important enough specifically to include in his address to Congress was a proposal to supplant the eight existing appropriation committees in the House of Representatives with a single committee, "in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication, as much as possible, avoided." Any effect of this recommendation during the present session will depend upon early action by the House. Within two weeks all of the eight committees will be at work upon the estimates delivered to them by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The reason why the House has been willing to go on for years with so decentralized an organization is the same reason that led, forty years ago, to the break-up of the original one-committee plan: More members desire to participate in the spending of public funds than can possibly be accommodated on a single committee. That, of course, is the best argument that can at present be advanced for a return to the original organization. Many of the troubles in American politics are due less to the fact that certain men hold too much power than to the fact that too many men hold power that is hidden and without responsibility. "There are as many byways to the Treasury," an earlier leader of the House remarked, "as there are members of these appropriation committees."

No plan could make complete centralization possible. If the one-committee plan is adopted there will still be need of subcommittees, for coast-defense appropriations and the navy and so on. But in this case the byways will run through a central legislative agency before they lead to the Treasury. Each appropriation bill will not have to be considered irrespective of all other appropriation bills—and as if it were the only appropriation bill Congress ever intended to pass. There can be a more comprehensive grasp of what the public service requires than is possible in the present patchwork system. There can be avoided much of that too friendly interest which individual committees display in particular branches of the public service. And there can probably be achieved such other desirable results as the elimination of certain petty jealousies between committees and the saving of time in the consideration of appropriation measures.

But there are certain other desirable results which the President's proposal can never achieve. For one thing, completely as it may unify response it can never unify initiative. And the reason is, that Congress never decides how much money it will spend. Congress decides, simply, how much it will cut or pad the estimates submitted to it by the administration. The estimates are the framework of the system. Without them Congress has nothing whatever to guide it in judging the necessities of government.

The estimates are the framework. But are the estimates coördinated? A single messenger carries them to the Capitol. Further than this coördination does not go. Each department head places an independent set of estimates before Congress. Each quite naturally considers exclusively the needs and opportunities of his own department. No one naturally considers the relative merits of this department's estimates as against that one's, or as against the aggregate government expenditures, or as against the possible income that taxes and bond issues will yield.

It would, accordingly, contribute to the reduction of waste and duplication if the executive and his cabinet should consider the estimates as a whole before asking any new single Congressional committee likewise to consider them as a whole. For clearly there can be waste and duplication in the processes of budget-making, as well as of budget-appropriating. And consideration of the estimates as a whole by the cabinet would supply a central executive responsibility at present lacking. It would leave to Congress the responsibility properly its own—that of granting, curtailing or increasing a set of estimates for which the administration unifiedly stood sponsor. It is the other half of any budget reform. It is a change which could be had without special legislation, upon the initiative of the executive.

In the next stage of legislation there are, of course, new difficulties. Waste and duplication might be found in the final act, even though it were originally built by a single responsible legislative committee upon the framework supplied by a single responsible administrative agency.

For every chairman of a committee with a supply bill is familiar with the struggle that is necessary, not to keep his bill from being cut down, but to keep the House from running away with it. A lack of genuine party responsibility demands individual success in politics; and too often individual success means no more than log-rolling. Seventy years of observation led the Confederate States to place in their Constitution restrictions upon the privilege of the individual delegate to move increases in an appropriation measure. But such restrictions are not immediately attainable in Congress—granted that they would be compatible in the absence of a complete shift to the cabinet system of government. And it is probable that without them log-rolling would largely be discouraged if each appropriation bill carried the prestige of having been drawn by a responsible committee acting upon responsible estimates.

In these circumstances, as a rule, the action of the House would be painstaking. What is the next step? Mr. Wilson himself tells us, in his study of Congressional Government. "Unfortunately," he says, "the dealings of the Senate with money bills generally render worthless the painstaking action of the House. . . . As they return from the Senate the appropriation bills usually propose grants of many additional millions." Had Mr. Wilson waited until today to write Congressional Government he would have found no reason to alter his opinion of the Senate's practices. Theoretically presumed to hold no powers of initiative in financial legislation, the Senate added more than half a billion dollars to the first War Appropriation bill, almost a billion to the second. It has added something to practically every regular appropriation bill that has come before it since Mr. Wilson became President. And in each addition there is no less an opportunity for waste and duplication than there is in the ordinary practices of the House. Obviously waste and duplication can be only inexpertly checked unless the Senate is included in the sweep of reforms.

What, then, becomes of the President's proposal? Certainly as a thorough measure of reorganization it fails. It touches neither the first nor the last process of financial legislation. One of the essentials of a completely reconstructed system it does supply, however; and it cannot fail to give impetus to other plans which will make Congress a more responsible institution. The difficulty has been that every proposed innovation has seemed to depend, for its achievement, upon the previous achievement of some other innovation. Favorable action by the House upon the President's proposal promises to cut a vicious circle.

C. M.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After the Play

AT the Vieux Colombier in West Thirty-fifth Street, one afternoon last week, when M. Jacques Copeau and his company were playing Les Fourberies de Scapin, I found myself seated next a lady of a certain age. Not vain of her person, I thought, but respectful of it, a face more well-preserved than worth preserving. But another vanity had withstood time. She was not above convincing her other neighbor, and perhaps me too more or less, that she adored the Fine Shades and knew French. When in Paris, as I discovered by trying not to listen, she lived at the Théâtre Français. Throughout the longer speeches, when Molière's words came rushing out with ear-baffling swiftness, she emitted little impious appreciative noises. After a dance, in which the drama of the antique world had made its spirit manifest, and which frankly had no secrets to hide from the least subtle eye, she audibly murmured, "Ah! but the nuances! such nuances!"

A woman like that ought not to be allowed inside the Vieux Colombier. There is no way of keeping her out, to be sure, but I wish there were. And when I say this I am speaking not for the few unfortunates who happen to sit within earshot of her appreciativeness, but for the many friends and acquaintances whom she will scare away from the Vieux Colombier by representing it as a place for the artistic, the specially prepared souls, the elect.

There could not be a sillier misrepresentation. M. Jacques Copeau's art is as easy to enjoy as it must be difficult to practise. It is a most friendly and most hospitable art. Its prime object is to give pleasure to you and me and the crowds that consist of us. In the French theatre, even more than in our own, we cannot help being rather eyes than ears, and one of M. Copeau's methods is to make a play's pleasure-giving quality a visible thing. So altogether remarkably does he succeed in this that I should advise even spectators who don't know any French to go to the Vieux Colombier and use their eyes. For twenty-five cents apiece they can buy at the theatre or the bookshops translations of the plays to be given. Once in the theatre they will suspect the stage director of having had their ignorance in mind, of being bent on nullifying it. For they will find the sense of what they have read coming back to them at the right moments, recalled by the expressiveness of faces, bodies, costumes, voices, scenery.

Even from the first two programs, all I have seen thus far, anybody who has not been thoroughly dulled and sophisticated by Broadway can guess M. Copeau's aims. Like Mr. Gordon Craig, he is one of the moderns who are turning stage direction into a fine art. Both men live by the faith that a stage director's always controlling object must be first to discern a play's distinguishing essential quality and then by all the means at his command to express this quality to the utmost. Both respect the play. Stated so, their belief sounds as simple as most revolutionary doctrines. Only by recalling the customs it breaks with can we measure the extent of its subversiveness. Here in the United States its acceptance would rid the theatre of pretty much everything that the ordinary manager holds dearest. Not his to look into a play in the hope of discovering its spirit. What he seeks are opportunities for expensive scenery, for expensive dresses to be worn by women who would never have become actresses if they had not been pretty, for reproductions of expensive objects existing in the real world. All such things distract attention from the play. M. Copeau's attention is always upon the play. So is ours when we go to his theatre.

We have all been present at one sort of innovating performances, where the scenery seemed self-consciously anxious to call attention to itself. We have all been confronted with scenery that was too beautiful for its play. M. Copeau won't have his scenery too beautiful. He wants it appropriate, wants it do its part and no more toward making the total impression. A like desire guides him throughout, whether in designing costumes, in lighting, in teaching his players how to speak, to move, to be still. Good acting is always a compromise. Suppose a pantomime carried to pantomime's conceivable limit, and therefore so expressive that one would never, literally not ever, be at a loss for the feeling that is unspoken by the mimes. Contrast this with the stillness of real persons as they sit in a modern room and talk, quietly, in what we call a conversational tone, with hands that do not interpret, with undramatic faces. Part of a stage director's work is to find for his company the right compromise between the inexpressiveness of ordinary life and the ultra-expressiveness of pantomime.

The right compromises are as many as the kinds of plays. Every kind calls for a new compromise which has to be imagined afresh. Pantomime contributes comparatively little, and real life comparatively much, to the production of Henri Becque's La Navette, where the departures from life, as necessary here as everywhere else, are fewer and slighter than in the production of Molière's early farce, La Jalousie du Burbouillé, in which pantomime carries the day, and for which M. Copeau has invented a movement that is the broken rhythm of high spirits, helter skelter and spontaneous. Every play must be a stage picture, but is there not another sort of picture, a painter's picture, by being which some plays will be most themselves? Such a play is Merimée's Coach of the Holy Sacrament, though you and I could not have discovered this. The discovery is M. Copeau's, who treats this Merimée so as to remind us, when we look at M. François Gournac's mask, as minutely finished as his acting in this part, or even at his costume with its ruffled shirt, of a painting by Gérome. There is here and there in La Navette a slight suggestion of engraving, despite the colors used, an intentional effect of black-and-whiteness, suited to its old-fashioned methodical cynicism, its gray meaning, its brief monotony.

Without having seen any of Mr. Gordon Craig's productions, and with nothing but his books and some of his designs to go by, I should guess that M. Copeau is interested in more forms of life, and therefore in more kinds of plays, more methods of attaining expressiveness. I imagine Mr. Gordon Craig a little neglectful of unbeautiful plays, whose spirit cannot be revealed by merely beautiful means, and M. Copeau readier to divine those other things which may be as worth revealing. He is a revolutionist in art who is without mannerism, and this combination means wide interests and an open mind.

I have never looked forward to a theatrical season with such curiosity, such excitement. What will M. Copeau's fine and original intelligence do with the inexhaustible French theatre? He is not a sectary. He has in his highly trained company a sensitive instrument. He knows how to coördinate lines, colors, sounds, motions. And what will his season do to us? Make us impatient, I hope, for ever after, with the padded superfluities of our theatrical tradesmen, and with their irrelevant expensive loads. Every artist, I should think, whether painter, musician or poet, would be eager to see, at the Vieux Colombier, how the simplest art of the theatre is the most expressive.

Q. K.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The So-Called Irish Question"

The Oppressed English, by Ian Hay. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co. 50 cents.

THERE is a joke that England is the Celt's oyster, whether the Celt be Irish, Welsh or Scotch. It is a fair sort of pleasantry, part of the badinage of clubs, the affability of coffee and cigarettes, but beyond that it spreads rather thinly. It is in reality a bit of pious family fraud. Whether the English enjoy it or not I don't know. I know as an Irishman that I don't enjoy it. No Irishman who has fastened his thoughts on the home rule bill is likely to greet this sort of thing with hilarity.

And yet here comes Captain Beith with an elaboration of the jest into a small volume of British propaganda chiefly on the subject of Irishmen loyal and disloyal. It is possible for him only because he starts with the enormous presumption that the Irish question is a family question. And American discussion of this "so-called Irish question" surprises him. The stay-at-home Briton "always imagined that his domestic troubles were his own property, and were not causing concern to other people." But Captain Beith is not above discussing these "domestic troubles" with Americans, of course in an amused and jovial spirit, and is perfectly willing to explain Irish troubles, and explain them away. It is important to mark the fact that he is proclaiming the situation as "domestic." That really means an affair between free legal partners. It means that the fairness of the partnership is not questioned by him; or that anything so old, unhappy and far-off as Irish nationalism is either hinted at or recalled.

If you start with a false hypothesis, there is only one thing to do with facts that don't fit it—hack away the feet, to use a pretty Chestertonian phrase, to fit the shoes. This little book on the oppressive Irish is a continuous pantomime of poor Captain Beith hacking the feet of the Irish question to fit them into his idea of happy-family shoes. Considering the elegance of the shoes he has provided for Ireland, there is every reason for him to be angry with Ireland's awkward nationalistic feet. But in his reckless eagerness to make a case for his class-bound vision of Ireland there is only one drawback, he has simply played hash with the facts. It isn't extraordinary. It is, on the contrary, touchingly human. But, however human it may be, facts are entitled to a scintilla of deference. Disregard of them isn't either cricket, baseball or pinochle. And, if Captain Beith is going to be a propagandist, he must learn the elementary rules of the game.

For example, who told Captain Beith that the home rule bill planned to give Ireland "an annual free gift of about thirty-five million dollars"? Who seduced him into believing that the settlement of the land question was "an experiment in philanthropy which cost the tyrannical English considerably more than five hundred million dollars"? Who assured him, guileless and gullible, that the national insurance act was not applied to Ireland? The national insurance act was applied to Ireland in the broad daylight of 1911, in spite of Captain Beith's curious illusion that the Irish refused to accept it and "so the oppressed English as usual gave way and paid the piper alone." As for land purchase costing the English taxpayer five hundred millions dollars, it is the best though the least intentional joke in the volume. The Irish tenant farmer, it is true, received his advance from the British treasury under the Wyndham act; but "now, as heretofore," in the words of Paul-Dubois, "he must sooner or later repay to the Treasury in annuities the full amount of capital that it advanced to him." Meanwhile, the huge sums advanced went to "great landlords of English descent, who spent most of their time in London"; who were said by Lord Cowper in 1887 to be so negligent of their responsibility that "one could count on one's fingers the number of Irish estates on which the improvements have been made by the landlord"; and who are reputed to have taken a billion dollars in rent during the nineteenth century. Captain Beith's statement as to an "annual free gift" is similarly hallucinatory. There has been a considerable amount of free gift between England and Ireland. A government commission in 1896 reported that Ireland was overtaxed fifteen million dollars a year. Until the old age pensions act Ireland contributed an annual surplus to the treasury, amounting since the union to about two billion dollars. Since 1910 Ireland has not been run at a profit to the British Empire. It has less than half the railroads of Scotland, has less than quarter the classes that can produce any income tax. The home rule bill could not decree prosperity, but it counted on a deficit of no more than ten million dollars. The additional twenty-five million are a light touch of Captain Beith's own.

Why these aberrations on the part of a propagandist? Simply because it is impossible to pay scrupulous attention to facts and still maintain the hypothesis that the Irish are free and therefore wholly to blame. But there is a dark side to that amiable hypothesis. Why, if Captain Beith is fair, does an English lunacy seem so different from an Irish one? Why does he think it right that the "afflicted officer" who killed Sheehy-Skeffington during the Irish rebellion should be put in an insane asylum while approving that the "degenerate criminal lunatic named Casement" be hanged? Is an English madman to be pitied, an Irish madman to be execrated? Is this precisely "domestic"? And is "degenerate" a word that insinuates sexual pervert? On the bare evidence of a document secretly circulated by British propagandists after Roger Casement's death, this intimation was purveyed to the American press. There was no newspaper in New York so mean as to print it at the time, but it was widely circulated by Alfred Noyes, and a Philadelphia paper did print it.

Does Captain Beith join Alfred Noyes in saying that Roger Casement was a "degenerate"? I know nothing as to the hidden evidence, but to launch such an accusation without backing it seems to me contemptible.

The best English liberals hate this sort of thing, yet none of them has shown any gallantry in dealing with the underhand indictment of Casement. The field is left to propagandists, men without much balance or sense. It is a pity, when sensible Americans may take Captain Beith's unsupported word for it. As for little matters like land finance, national insurance acts and taxation—these, luckily, are things that the "temperamental," "lovable but irresponsible" Irish can say something about.

So far as the empire is concerned, Captain Beith means well. It is his reasoning that is at fault. It might be better if Ireland were really united to the empire, as he chooses to imagine, but the stark fact is the compulsion that has been exercised for hundreds of years to bind Ireland to England, and the failure of England to win any great number of Irishmen to the empire outside the obvious descendants of Scotch and English settlers. This is the point from which honest discussion must start. It is no good pretending that the Irish have a special psychology. If they have not the same psychology as other residents of the empire, there is still enough difference in their political

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and economic status to account for their attitude again and again. For over thirty years three-quarters of the population have voted solidly and unequivocally for a home rule that English Toryism has denied. Of such invincible ignorance on the part of a ruling class are rebels and rebellions made. The Irish rebellion was not made in Germany. It was made in England, and not a little part of it was made by just such dunderheads as Captain Beith, with their inaccurate talk of beneficences that were never really conferred and freedom that never existed.

The situation is, of course, intrinsically difficult. Apart from the awkwardness of one race trying to control another by an administrative machinery that is essentially undemocratic and class-bound, there is the ultimate difficulty of governmental remoteness and inflexibility, with a premium put on agitation as the sole Irish political activity that promises to pay. You cannot profitably turn politics into a duel between bureaucrats and agitators in a country that is undeveloped and uneducated, that cries for decent administration and a healthy frame of mind. What about Ulster, Captain Beith says, as if the presence of Tories in Ireland were an insuperable obstacle to fundamental reform. The American Revolution disposed of a similar question. Tory Ulster can be securely safeguarded, as the present convention will probably demonstrate, but the one fact obvious to genuine democrats is that nothing, not even Captain Beith's parlor humor, should stand in the way of fundamental reform.

F. H.

Louis Untermeyer

These Times, by Louis Untermeyer. New York: Henry Holt and Co. $1.25.

ONE is grateful to Mr. Untermeyer for doing what almost none of his contemporaries on this side of the water thinks of doing. For about the last thing that poets and theorizers about poetry in these days think of is beauty. In discussion and practice beauty is almost entirely left out of consideration. Frequently they do not concern themselves with it at all. A visitor from another planet—a modern efficiency expert's ideal world, let us say, where no such thing as poetry is known—after listening in at a debate on poetry, would probably leave earth with a firm impression that the art was anything from a sort of word-photography to a kind of mechanical game with something called "the public" as objective. He might go off convinced that it was a way in which certain people unburdened themselves of their opinions about the world, or voiced their reactions on everything from their own personal feelings to sunsets or modern movements. Certainly he might well fail to gather that poetry had at all to do with the rhythmical expression, in beautiful speech, of the imaginative spirit of man as it manifests itself before life in vision or song.

One is grateful to Mr. Untermeyer because he takes beauty into account, because he feels it, strives for it, and often, as he deserves, wins it for his own. For beauty too is grateful to Mr. Untermeyer, one may fancy, and shines out through his work in many places. Particularly, pieces like Magic, The Sleepers, Truce, Plaza Square know more than a brief and fugitive visitation. Beauty glows, quietly, like evening itself, in the subjoined stanzas from Magic:

Motionless in the meadows
The trees, the rocks, the cows . . .
And quiet dripped from the shadows
Like rain from heavy boughs.

The tree-toads started ringing
Their ceaseless silver bells;
A land-locked breeze came swinging
Its censer of sweet smells.

The river's tiny cañon
Stretched into dusky lands;
Like a dark and silent companion
Evening held out her hands.

Hushed were the dawn's bravados;
Loud noon was a silenced cry—
And quiet slipped from the shadows
As stars slip out of the sky.

Mr. Untermeyer evidently feels evening deeply, more perhaps than any other period of the day, as is further instanced in Plaza Square and the following quotations from Truce:

And still in the room, the uncertain and slow
Twilight paused with its purple half-shadows, half-shine.
Then stopped—as if seeing her it could go
No further, but stood in a trembling glow
Like a pilgrim stumbling upon a shrine.

The people passed, wrapped in a genial spell;
Transfigured by the screening snow that fell,
Fluttering its white
And great compassionate wings,
Hiding the black world and all sharp-edged things.
Quiet—ineffable and complete. . . .

But this is the less frequent vision with Mr. Untermeyer. He more often feels and expresses a bolder, livelier mood, both in himself and in the world. October, Creation, Wind and Flame are instances. The stirring stanzas To the Child of a Revolutionist and Reveille show him at his best in the ringing sort of verse he is partial to. For Mr. Untermeyer is eloquent when he is fired and has a mastery of vigorous effective phrases that, even when dwindling to rhetoric, are good of their kind. Eve Speaks and Moses on Sinai, particularly the former, are cases in point, and despite the monotony of the blank verse used a certain forcefulness of conviction keeps up the momentum when the thought is naïve or the eloquence flags.

Mr. Untermeyer also has a real gift of description. Time and again he lights on a happy word that in the right place does more than twenty would. It is noticeable that these are most often metaphors in the verb, compact and vivid felicities that lend strength and vigor to a style. A path "dodges" among bushes; the "running grasses" on a slope "stop" where the cliff begins; the salt wind "sniffs" at the skin of a swimmer on a blowy day before he takes the plunge; people startled by what they mistake in the dusk for a satyr advance with "creaking courage"; a moonlight bather leaps on the bank, "his body in the moonlight dripping stars." These are a few, taken at random.

Of a piece with this gift of description is the poet's ability for swift incisive portraiture in brief telling strokes. He is not taken in by many of the world's shams and lies,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that is more than can be said of every young poet. Thirteen Portraits illustrate both these qualities in Mr. Untermeyer, particularly good being the portraits of An American, A Poet, A Dilettante, A Woman, A Chopin Player and His Audience. This last may be given as representative:

His fingers press upon the keys as though
His hands were dripping thick and heavy sirup.
The sweetness does not cloy; it seems to stir up
All sorts of greasy sentiments that grow
Maudlin and morbid. Tears begin to flow;
Young girls breathe heavily or sob unchidden;
Matrons and spinsters dream of things forbidden. . .
He piles the pathos on—*adagio*.

The concert ends. The powder-puffs come out.
A dying buzz—and people go about
Their idleness or drudgery as before. . .
And in his taxi no one hears him say,
"I'll have to dye my hair; it's almost gray.
There was a time they used to weep much more."

This is cutting, healthy and true.

Of course Mr. Untermeyer is not always equally successful, either in attaining to real poetry, as in Magic, or in satire, as in his admirable A Man. Beauty is not yet a captive at his car, his vision is sometimes not so keen, his *bravura* does not always stir. He rarely fails to be sincere, however, even when he becomes rhetorical and declamatory, or lapses from taste. He is too much committed to a certain physical view of life, perhaps, which tends mechanically to foist a set mood on him and determine what his attitude shall be toward things, when he becomes conscious of himself. It is this that makes The Dead Horse only a *tour de force* in verse. Lovers, too, like all work of the sort—commendably scarce in this book—is not poetry. It is talk, as such pieces must always be. You may say "good things" in this form, witty, true, even fine things, but it is talk for all that, not poetry.

One trouble with Mr. Untermeyer, indeed, is that he is not half enough content to be the good poet that he is. He is possessed of a gift and of a specialized, rather naïve philosophy of life, and his gift distinctly suffers for it. For life presents itself to him too much as being merely blind activity, "feverish intensity," "triumphant restlessness," in his own words. He finds the meaning of life in strife and struggle, even though these in themselves should be meaningless. "Aroused more for the contest than the goal" he says. He does not see that, while wishing to magnify life and extend its claims, he is in fact unconsciously limiting it. He wishes to affirm life, but his affirmation is sometimes the affirmation of a strepitancy, of a noisy negation. Mr. Untermeyer must possess exceptional health. (He is a sort of laureate of health.) Either that or he has the valetudinarian's worship of it. Probably the former, for his vision of life, his appreciation and enjoyment of it, is still too greatly the expression of his physical well being, and not the crystallization of a state of spirit, above the accidents of time.

When Mr. Untermeyer is older he will write better poetry. This is not so gratuitous as it may look, and means more than merely that years will bring their almost inevitable yield of growth. Mr. Untermeyer has fire, but it is not that which needs chastening. It is imagination he needs, the imagination of contemplation—the other half of poetry. His work gives hints of it. But there must be development of it before he can do enduring work. If youth is against him, its flush will go. Age has its compensations of riper wisdom and quieter insight. If Mr. Untermeyer wills, he may learn that there is more in life than his philosophy dreams of. He may discover deeper beauties, serener harmonies, less tumultuous than he had imagined but more wonderful and compelling. They are there to find.

M. T.

An Ode to Freedom

Freedom, by Gilbert Cannan. London: Headley Bros., Ltd. 2s.

MR. CANNAN'S book will, in all probability, be anathema to the conventional political theorist. It has no order and no system. It is almost blank of historical references. The style is spasmodic, alternately glowing and rapturous with egregious lapses into bathos, and sombre with the periods of the wailing prophet, who finds that all is vanity. Often there is great beauty—"In all countries men love their wives, their children, and nearly all men have at the back of their minds some dear scene—a rugged hill-top against the sky, the bend of a river threading through the willows, a gay and busy street, or even a grim, dull thoroughfare making a drab background for gay, fantastic thoughts." There is bitter, eloquent anger—"To supply the colored races with trash in return for valuable raw materials vast numbers of the white races of the world are kept in virtual slavery, and for this precious privilege can be turned against each other in ghastly wars. Such, in brief, is the noble activity to maintain which the State is invoked to suppress the individual will, conscience and responsibility." There is nonsense and platitude—"No man can define mind. It is not seated in the head. The heart also has its reasons. The solar plexus has its say in the affairs of mind, and the nerve of a tooth may profoundly modify an idea." There is great wisdom and insight—"The modern man has a kind of awful respect for the industrial system, but none for the men who have mastered it and so grip him by the entrails, but make no attempt to hold him by his mind and spirit."

What is the impulse back of this curious jumble, this excited, foolish and wise, beautiful and stupid, essay? Mr. Cannan has truthfully named his book. In modern terms he makes an ancient plea. His employment of industrial terminology is a mere chronological accident. Because it is 1917 and not 1317 he attacks, instead of the pretenses of the Church, the pretenses of the State, our modern Idol. It is an ever-old, ever-new attack, an ever-old, ever-new assertion of the dignity of the individual human spirit. Mr. Cannan belongs to the small and courageous minority who refuse to let any so-called sovereign power shoulder their personal responsibility for a moral decision, such as is involved, for instance, in taking up arms. Naturally his bitterest shafts are saved for conscription, which has rapidly become industrial as well as military. He gives the impression that never in the history of the world was there so little freedom and so much talk of it, so little real courage and so much sham bravery, so many vicarious sacrificers and patriots at the head of governments egging young men on to mutual slaughter in order to gratify their own safely protected pride, so much hypocrisy and fear before the hobgoblins of prestige, domination, security, etc. He fear-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lessly writes the kind of criticism which can only be written today by a man of great moral courage, whether in England, America or Germany. His recent prison sentence attests that much at least. Fortunately, moreover, it is not the type of defiance that, however stimulating, is also naïve. If Mr. Cannan misses the academic virtues, he is sophisticated. No one seriously supposes that if any State were attacked or even in problematical danger it would lack sufficient voluntary defenders. Conscriptionists sometimes say this, although it is doubtful if they know what they are really saying; namely, that a State which treats its citizens so badly in time of peace that they will not protect it in time of war, ought to force men to give their lives for a system which they have by definition shown themselves unready and unwilling to defend. So Mr. Cannan is not worried about the minority that will not fight, even under severe social pressure. Nor is any true statesman. The real problem comes in how to safeguard this minority. Mr. Cannan's solution is a very old solution—freedom.

Yet the specific proposals of Mr. Cannan for sharply limited "sovereignty" and division of powers—proposals embedded in a thick soil of invective and prophecy—are rapidly ceasing to be mere minority views. For if anything is safe prediction, it is the prediction that after this war men will not tolerate the absolute state. Mr. Cannan hardly goes further in his vague syndicalistic suggestions than conservative trade unions have already done. It is already realized that the federal principle must not mean more than the composing of differences between different types of sovereignty, rather than the inclusion of separate powers into a single centralized power. The author is as vindictive before the prospect of an apotheosized man-in-the-street or a ruthless labor majority as he is before the national capitalistic groups now struggling for a mastery that would be more costly than defeat. But what cohesive force, you ask, does Mr. Cannan suggest to hold together in cooperative peace and sanity these divided powers and split-up states, these racial groups? Here, perhaps, Mr. Cannan will be called naïve. "Its (the government's) authority comes now from the moral sense of the people, that sense by which they are in touch with a power greater than themselves." In other words, good-will and good sense. And in the end, when the war is over, it will come down to that.

H. S.

The Open Mind

The Contingency of the Laws of Nature, by Emile Boutroux, translated by Fred Rothwell. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co. $1.50.

THOSE who genuinely value the freedom of the human mind will always speak with respect of the great rationalists of the eighteenth century. It is they who broke the back of ecclesiastical and political restraints on science and renewed the old faith in the dignity and brotherhood of man. But we cannot withhold a smile at their naïve faith that the age of reason was actually at hand when they merely replaced the old dogmas with new ones. The most noteworthy of the new dogmas was the belief that the whole universe is a mechanical contrivance in which nothing can happen except in absolute accordance with the eternal and unalterable laws of mechanics. It was indeed a most useful dogma, for it helped to banish the open belief in magic and witchcraft and in antiquated moral codes based on the authority of miracles. But the social utility of a belief is not the same as its physical proof, however much we are inclined in our weaker moments to blur over the distinction.

There are enlightened brethren who will at once jump at this and exclaim: "Who is this obscurantist that dares cast doubt on the reign of law which modern science has so clearly proved?" Peace, brethren! Which modern science has proved, or can prove, the impossibility of chance happenings in this world of ours? There is not a single law of nature that can be verified with absolute accuracy, for the simple reason that we have no instruments which can measure with absolute precision. Ask a chemist whether he ever gets exactly twice as much hydrogen as oxygen from the decomposition of water, or in fact whether he ever gets exactly the same result repeating itself, and he will tell you: "Well, no, but the variations are so small, that they may be neglected for practical purposes." Observe that chance variations which may be neglected for practical purposes are not proved to be non-existent. Of course, you meet the scientist who will tell you. "The chance variations are all due to us. The object in itself never varies its conformity to law." But this is a respectable philosophic belief, not a scientific demonstration; for when you press your scientific friend, he knows little of the *object in itself* apart from his measurements of it. On the other hand, you will meet with scientists of the titanic breed who frankly speak of scientific truths in terms of greater or less probability or as statistical averages. You may, if you like it, believe that every particle of matter attracts every other particle precisely as the products of the masses and inversely as the square of the difference. But careful scientists like

TIFFANY & CO.

JEWELRY SILVERWARE CLOCKS
WATCHES CHINA STATIONERY

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET
NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Poynting and J. J. Thomson will warn you that none of our evidence rules out the possibility that on some kinds of matter the attraction is greater and on some less. All we know definitely is that when we take the enormous masses represented in the planets the average conforms to our law. If in the whole world the number of men and women were equal, it would not follow that they were equally distributed in every family. Science, therefore, has not disproved the existence of absolute or spontaneous chance. The most original of our American scientific thinkers, Charles S. Peirce, boldly defended the priority of chance and regarded law as a sort of general habit which things have accidentally acquired. Boltzmann, one of the leading physicians of the last century, made it the principal business of his long scientific career to suggest that the presence of regularity in the world was due to the fact that as the world-mixture was being thoroughly shaken up, the various elements were approaching a more uniform distribution; but that this did not preclude the remote probability of the world process reversing itself (water starting to run uphill, etc.), and the whole world order in which we live returning to chaos and night whence it sprung. If you think this is altogether too fanciful, study the Brownian movements and you will see something like it under the microscope. In brief, the account which science keeps with the world (of it) is not yet closed. You may, if you like, jump to the conclusion that the total universe is an eternal machine that never wears out. But you have no more right to do so than the one who thinks that it is like a tree that grows or dies by imperceptible degrees.

None of this, of course, disturbs the genuine natural scientist. Approximate or probable truths are good enough for him. The philosopher, however, is, as a rule, not content to live in an unfinished world. There must be no open windows or draughty cracks to disturb his cozy reflections, and he will not tolerate the thought that the world is not a docile pupil incapable of turning up anything contrary to the rules laid down for it. But as philosophy has never entirely ceased to be the auxiliary of theology, it has always felt called upon to invent some device whereby a supernatural influence may enter an eternally closed system of nature. Many systems of philosophy may thus be characterized as elaborate devices whereby a deus ex machina may be freely introduced into a closed air-tight temple.

It is curious to note that France which produced in La Place the arch priest of the closed view of the world, produced in Cournot and Boutroux, the two foremost opponents of this view. While Cournot, like our own Peirce, did so simply out of logical or purely intellectual motives, M. Boutroux does so clearly in the interest of humanistic and thinly veiled theologic ones. Like Bergson and other French writers, Boutroux relies more on the piling up of suggestions than on the close concatenation of arguments. This rhetorical method of exposition allows a good deal of appeal to such edifying but unilluminating distinction as that between the "higher" and the "lower" and, in general, to doctrines which are plausible and widely accepted but not accurate or readily demonstrable. Nevertheless this book does abound in shrewd insights and in keen criticisms of the half-baked monistic philosophy which underlies current popular science.

As an antidote to current deterministic mythology such as the economic determinism of Marx or the psychologic determinism of Freud, the reading of this book may be highly recommended. But the critically minded will not be satisfied with Mr. Boutroux's account of the part that necessary law does play in the natural world. His systematic disparagment of logical, mathematical and physical law does not do full justice to these elements of exact science. The world may not be in all respects subject to certain laws; and what exists may be more than what is necessary. But necessity is, after all, a genuine part of the world stream. M. R. C.

From Death to Life, by A. Apukhtin. (Gems of Russian Literature, Vol. 1.) New York: R. Frank. 60 cents.

AS the first volume of a series of Gems of Russian Literature, From Death to Life is hardly a wise choice. For perhaps a common quality in Chekov, Tolstoi, Turgenev, Dostoievsky, leads one to expect pitiless, merciful truth from any Russian. And in that frame of mind one reads this simple, freshly told story of soul transmigration, to wonder at the end if one has not missed the point, the great, the subtly Russian point; if Apukhtin intended to give so childishly simple a picture of the soul; if somewhere cannot be found a word to reveal the universe of discovery and doubt supposedly native in Russians. But one can unearth only a few characteristically real bits of dialogue, a few deftly animated figures, a pleasant sense of nature. Such a trifle might seem memorable if stumbled on or more humbly presented, but for the first of a number of Gems of Russian Literature it is scarce more glowing than artful glass.

[In our issue of November 17th The War and the Spirit of Youth should have been attributed to the Atlantic Monthly Press, Inc., not to the Houghton Mifflin Company. We regret the mistake.]

Contributors

to this issue

WILLIAM HARD is a writer on political and economic subjects, and is now in Washington studying problems of organization for the New Republic.

ROBERT SILLIMAN HILLYER was recently graduated from Harvard University and is now teaching in the Berkshire School, Sheffield, Massachusetts.

ESTHER NORTON has studied at Columbia University and is now doing war work.

EMILY JAMES PUTNAM is an educator and is the author of Selections from Lucian and other books.

ISAAC DON LEVINE is on the staff of the New York Tribune.

AMERICAN IDEALS

Edited by Norman Foerster and W. W. Pierson, Jr.

"Ushered in by Mr. Woodbury's splendid sonnet, 'Our First Century,' these selections from various addresses and state papers dealing with American ideals of government from the point of view of famous statesmen and men of letters, challenge as well as inspire."—*Boston Transcript.* *$1.25 postpaid*

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago

THE MODERN SCHOOL MAGAZINE

Articles by Ridgely Torrence, Marietta Johnson, Maxwell Bodenheim, Carlos Wuppermann, Stephen Haweis; Readingsin Libertarian Education; illustrations after Corot, Cezanne, Blake, Early Florentine Woodcuts, in the December number.

Ten cents a copy. One dollar a year

THE MODERN SCHOOL STELTON, NEW JERSEY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED